



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 103^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, September 13, 1993

The House met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MURTHA].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 13, 1993.

I hereby designate the Honorable JOHN P. MURTHA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Ronald F. Christian, Office of the Bishop, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, ruler of the world, guardian of the weak, protector of the defenseless, and the author of peace,

Today, we thank You for those who sit together at the table of concord and seek a more excellent way for the peoples and countries of this world to work for justice and live in harmony.

Bless, we humbly and fervently pray, all those who now labor and those who have labored to build this great foundation upon which a house of peace can be constructed.

May all people, everywhere, seek and find in that house, shelter and safety from the tragedies and triumphs of the life.

Reassure us all, oh God, of Your peace which results from hearts softened by Your forgiveness and thoughts molded by Your grace.

Give strength of purpose to those who lead, and enlighten those who sit in council, so that all nations and people will exalt service over gain and righteousness over glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled joint resolution on Friday, September 10, 1993:

S.J. Res. 90. Joint resolution designating September 10, 1993, as "National POW/MIA Recognition Day" and authorizing the display of the National League of Families POW/MIA flag.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF BRITISH-AMERICAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 168(b) of Public Law 102-138, the Chair, on behalf of the Speaker, appoints the following Member to the British-American Interparliamentary Group on the part of the House:

Mr. HAMILTON of Indiana, Chairman.
There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title.

H.J. Res. 220. Joint resolution to designate the month of August as "National

Scleroderma Awareness Month", and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolutions and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 50. Joint resolution to designate the weeks of September 19, 1993, through September 25, 1993, and of September 18, 1994, through September 24, 1994, as "National Rehabilitation Week";

S.J. Res. 94. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 3, 1993, through October 9, 1993, as "National Customer Service Week"; and

S. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the sixtieth anniversary of the Ukraine famine of 1932-1933 should serve as a reminder of the brutality of Stalin's repressive policies toward the Ukrainian people.

AN OPPORTUNITY FOR PEACE

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, on this tremendous occasion of the possibility of peace in the world, I want to give tremendous credit to former President George Bush and former Secretary of State James Baker. They were objective. They placed a continual urging for peace in the Middle East, and showed that America could deal with that region in an objective fashion. In addition, the efforts of Jimmy Carter and all Presidents speak well for today, and President Clinton has followed through in those objective efforts of former President George Bush.

But it will not be easy. The last accord brought the loss of Anwar Sadat and the hounding of Menachem Begin. So let God be with Arafat and with Rabin, and with all free people in their quest for peace.

But certainly today is a hallmark and an opportunity for peace for all free people. Let us all join forces today and urge that this continuum move forward.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

ADMINISTRATION LACKING IN TRUST ON WORDS AND NUMBERS

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, it seems that in order to fulfill their goal of re-inventing Government, the Clinton administration decided that it first had to reinvent math.

The Washington Post editorial page, ordinarily the lead vocal in the Clinton chorus, notes today that the savings claimed from reinventing Government are exaggerated.

This should come as no surprise: The Clinton budget numbers never added up:

His claim to cut 25 percent from the White House staff is pure fiction.

The OMB finally released a mid-session review of the budget which lowered projections for economic growth by a full percentage point, but expects no impact on the deficit.

The reinventing Government savings are exaggerated.

And next the administration will promise to deliver \$90 billion in new health care benefits without harming the economy or increasing the deficit.

Members of Congress and the American public need accurate information and data to make informed policy decisions, but the numbers crunchers in this administration have traded their green eye shades for rose colored glasses.

Mr. Speaker, if we cannot believe their numbers when it comes to a re-inventing Government proposal that affects less than one-half of 1 percent of Government spending, how are we supposed to trust their numbers on a health care plan that affects fully one-seventh of our entire economy?

Once again, we see that there are only two things you cannot trust the Clinton administration with—words and numbers.

H. RES. S.O.S.: STAMP OUT SECRECY

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, not until it was obvious that Congressman JIM INHOFE had the necessary signatures to bring House Resolution 134 to a vote, did the Rules Committee decide to hold hearings. I guess the House leadership has decided that necessity is to be the mother of intervention.

I am sure you remember House Resolution 134. I like to call it House Resolution S.O.S. because it will stamp out secrecy around here, so that the people who elected us will know what we are doing. Editorial pages and talk shows all over America are lauding the effort. There were rallies over the weekend

celebrating the victor and praising Members who signed the petition.

But getting the petition signed means we have just crossed the starting line. The question remains whether the supporters will be able to stay on board until we reach the finish line. There will be several procedural votes before then and the House leadership will be trying to push people off the reform bandwagon at every legislative twist and turn.

Congressman INHOFE and Rules Committee Republicans will be speaking on the floor after today's business to explain what the secret agents are up to. Let us listen and prepare. This opportunity to pass House Resolution S.O.S. and stamp out secrecy in the House may not come again.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV. Such votes, if postponed, will be taken after consideration of House Resolution 248.

AUTHORIZING PLAN, DESIGN, AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE WEST COURT OF NATIONAL MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY BUILDING

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2677) to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan, design, and construct the west court of the National Museum of Natural History building.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2677

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PLANNING, DESIGN, AND CONSTRUCTION OF WEST COURT OF NATIONAL MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY BUILDING.

The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution is authorized to plan, design, and construct the West Court of the National Museum of Natural History building.

SEC. 2. FUNDING.

No appropriated funds may be used to pay any expense of the planning, design, and construction authorized by section 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Ordinarily, at this time I would yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Missouri, Congressman BILL CLAY, chairman of the Committee on House Administration's Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials and ask that he be allowed to control this time. However, he has been unavoidably delayed, so I intend to proceed at this time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2677 would authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan, design, and construct a series of activities to be located in the west court of this Smithsonian Museum. These construction projects include a book store, an enlarged public restaurant, and a new theater. The bill is revenue neutral and would not require a Federal appropriation. The Smithsonian Museum intends to use its own borrowing authority to fund the project. This bill has the support of the members of the subcommittee as well as the full committee.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of H.R. 2677, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1210

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 2677. This measure will authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan, design, and construct the west court of the National Museum of Natural History building.

The Smithsonian museums are some of Washington's most visited attractions. However, many people may not realize some of the other vital contributions the museums make with regard to educating our students. The Smithsonian educational programs reach out to students across the nation.

The purpose of this bill is to expand the museum's current west court facilities. It will establish an interactive educational center and an expanded commercial facility. The proposal includes a large-screen theater, greater educational space, and a large increase in the museum's commercial space. The modifications are necessary to improve and advance the education of the museum's visitors.

One of the more amazing aspects of this project is that it will cost the American taxpayer absolutely nothing. This comes at a time when streamlining and belt-tightening by the Federal Government are under way, to promote effective and efficient use of taxpayer dollars. I would like to applaud the efforts of the Smithsonian and commend the Institution on its fiscal responsibility. The Smithsonian has done its part to relieve the burden on the American taxpayer, through independent investment and careful regulation of spending.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to give their full support to H.R. 2677.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The purpose of H.R. 2677 is to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan, design, and construct the west court of the National Museum of Natural History building.

The National Museum of Natural History is the largest scientific research institute of the Smithsonian having over 200 active research projects throughout the world. The majority of projects emphasize research that will contribute to the understanding of global environmental change. Over seven million individuals visit the Smithsonian's National Museum of Natural History each year.

Although the Smithsonian has put forth significant efforts to educate the public using traditional exhibit technology, modern audiences actively seek deeper understanding of the world's environment and cultural heritage through more dynamic media. The Smithsonian Institution proposes to establish an interactive educational center and an expanded commercial facility by developing the west court of the museum. The redeveloped west court would total approximately 87,000 square feet of space containing a 488-seat, large-screen film theater, education space, doubling the size of the museum shop and expanding the museum restaurant.

The project will be financed entirely with external debt to the Smithsonian Institution. No federally appropriated funds will be used. It is estimated that total investment in the project will be \$32 million. The Smithsonian believes that with a current climate of advantageous interest rates, the project's projected incremental cash flow will repay the debt within 15 years of completion.

Section 1 authorizes the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan, design, and construct the west court of the National Museum of Natural History building.

Section 2 states that no appropriated funds may be used to pay any expense of the planning, design, and construction authorized by section 1.

H.R. 2677 was introduced on July 20, 1993 by Mr. MINETA, for himself, Mr. NATCHER, and Mr. MCDADE. The bill was jointly referred to the Committees on House Administration and Public Works and Transportation. The House Administration Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials held no hearing on the bill but favorably approved H.R. 2677 on July 22, 1993. On July 28, 1993, the Committee on Public Works and Transportation Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds held a hearing on the bill and approved it by voice vote on August 4, 1993. The full com-

mittee approved the bill by voice vote on August 5, 1993.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2677.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2677, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CHARLES E. BENNETT FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2431) to designate the Federal building in Jacksonville, FL, as the "Charles E. Bennett Federal Building."

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2431

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building at 400 Bay Street in Jacksonville, Florida, is designated as the "Charles E. Bennett Federal Building". If a new Federal building is built in Jacksonville, Florida, to replace the building at 400 Bay Street, the new Federal building shall be designated as the "Charles E. Bennett Federal Building".

SEC. 2. LEGAL REFERENCES.

Any reference in any law, regulation, document, record, map, or other paper of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 1 is deemed to be reference to the "Charles E. Bennett Federal Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very honored to support legislation which pays tribute to a man well known to this institu-

tion. Former Congressman Charles E. Bennett was elected to Congress on November 2, 1948. While in Congress for 39 years, Bennett set a record for not missing a single legislative vote.

Congressman Bennett served as vice chair of the House Armed Services Committee, and chair of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

It is a fitting and appropriate tribute to honor this distinguished American by designating the Federal Building located at 400 Bay Street in Jacksonville, FL, as the "Charles E. Bennett Federal Building."

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of H.R. 2431.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 2431, a bill designating the Federal Building in Jacksonville, FL, as the "Charles E. Bennett Federal Building."

Charlie Bennett was born in 1910, and earned both his undergraduate and law degrees from the University of Florida. Like many of his generation, he was a strong believer in patriotism and public service, and this belief determined the course of his life. It first led him into the practice of law, and then into the Army in World War II, where he served heroically. It eventually led him to the Halls of Congress, where he served honorably for 44 years.

Representative Bennett was on the House Armed Services Committee, where he was chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Seapower and Strategic and Critical Materials; and on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

He was a dedicated and conscientious representative of his constituents, and I believe that naming the Federal Building in Jacksonville after him is a much deserved way of recognizing his many years of distinguished service to his district and the Nation.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2431, a bill to designate the Federal building in Jacksonville, FL, as the "Charles E. Bennett Federal Building."

Charles E. Bennett was born December 2, 1910, and educated in Florida schools. He received a B.A. and J.D. from the University of Florida. He practiced law and served as a Member of the Florida House of Representatives in 1941.

Congressman Bennett had a distinguished military career. After enlisting in the Army in 1942, he served for 58 months, including guerrilla combat in the Philippines. He was awarded the Silver Star, Bronze Star, Combat Infantry Badge, Philippine Legion of Honor, and Gold Cross for Gallantry in Action, and French Legion of Honor.

Charles E. Bennett was elected to the 81st Congress on November 2, 1948, and served for 44 years, retiring in 1992. He served as vice chair of the House Armed Services Committee, Chairman

of the Seapower Subcommittee, former chair of the Committee on Standards and Conduct. For 39 years, our good friend did not miss one legislative vote on any rollcall. He was truly a Representative of the people in his dedication to his duties.

It is fitting that the Federal building in Jacksonville, FL, be named in honor of this distinguished legislator, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to speak today on behalf of H.R. 2431, legislation I introduced to designate the Federal building in Jacksonville, FL, as the "Charles E. Bennett Federal Building."

Congressman Bennett retired at the end of the 102d Congress after serving 44 years in the U.S. Congress. I now have the privilege of representing a large portion of Mr. Bennett's old district and as you can imagine, I have very large shoes to fill.

I have always considered Charlie Bennett to be a great American hero and a person whose career I have attempted to use as a benchmark for my own. For those of us who are fortunate to know him, Mr. Bennett is a fine example to follow.

Mr. Speaker, you, along with many, many Members of this body served with Charlie Bennett in Congress, so I do not need to tell you why he is so deserving of this honor. However, if you will allow me, I would like to mention a few of the notable accomplishments which mark his tremendous career.

Congressman Bennett was elected to Congress in November, 1947 and has the ninth longest record of continued service in the U.S. Congress. He answered over 17,000 recorded votes and did not miss a single legislative vote from June 5, 1951 through to the day of his retirement. As many of you know, Mr. Bennett came to Congress following 4 years of service in the Army during World War II. He contracted polio during the war and has been forced to use walking canes ever since. During his first campaign, some questioned his health and wondered whether he was physically able to meet his congressional responsibilities. In fact, Mr. Bennett was hospitalized several times during his first congressional term. But in the summer of 1951, with his medical difficulties behind him, Bennett decided that the best way to prove his physical abilities, mental resolve and commitment to the job to which he was elected, was to promise himself never to miss a legislative vote—and it was a promise he kept.

Mr. Bennett is a man of honor and integrity and left a legacy behind to prove it. His legislation created the House Ethics Committee—which he twice chaired. In addition, he authored the Code of Ethics for Government Service and other legislation in the area of government ethics. His legislation also made "In God We Trust" our national motto.

Bennett was also a champion of this country's Armed Forces. He believed, and still does, that our fighting men and women deserve the best equipment and training necessary to fulfill the missions to which they are assigned.

As chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Seapower, Bennett fought to enhance America's sealift capacity and en-

hance our U.S.-flagged fleet. In Jacksonville, Mr. Bennett is thought of as the father of the Navy. He worked to turn Mayport Naval Station, a surplus military facility when Bennett was elected to Congress, into a aircraft carrier homeport and the second largest such port on the East Coast. In addition, he successfully secured three naval air stations in Jacksonville. But Mr. Bennett's first love is the environment. Last year, he was quoted as saying, "I love the outdoors. It is the closest to God you can get while still on Earth." Because of his desire to protect this Nation's natural and historic resources for future generations, Bennett authored and secured the passage of national legislation to preserve historic sites and treasure ships and protect endangered species and ecologically sensitive sites. His legislation also created the Ft. Caroline National Memorial and the Timucuan Ecological and Historic Preserve in Jacksonville. Putting his money where his mouth is, Bennett also donated all of his excess campaign funds, over \$200,000, to the National Park Service for the purpose of land acquisition.

If you think all this makes Charlie Bennett a hero, you are correct. But he was already a hero when he got to Congress. As an Army captain, Mr. Bennett led guerrilla fighters in the Philippines in the Northern Luzon mountains and was awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action. The Philippines decorated him with the Legion of Honor, the highest award for a non-Filipino. He was elected to the Infantry Hall of Fame by the Fort Benning Officer Candidate School.

It is fair to say that no public official has done more for the city of Jacksonville than Charlie Bennett. In fact, few members of Congress have done more for this Institution than Charlie Bennett. He has been a tireless public servant and I admire him greatly.

Mr. Chairman, as you can tell, I think a great deal of Charlie Bennett and hope that all of my colleagues will support this legislation.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2431.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1220

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2431, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MURTHA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

GEORGE H. MAHON FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2532) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse in Lubbock, TX, as the "George H. Mahon Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2532

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1205 Texas Avenue in Lubbock, Texas, shall be known and designated as the "George H. Mahon Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "George H. Mahon Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I see our distinguished former chairman, Mr. Bennett, coming here. It is a great day with a monumental peace accord, but it is a sad day that not more Members are here to greet Mr. Bennett.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2532 honors another congressional giant in naming this Federal building after Congressman Mahon. George Mahon was first elected to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives in 1934, representing Texas' 19th Congressional District. He then served in the next 21 succeeding Congresses.

During his long tenure in Congress, Congressman Mahon worked with 8 Presidents and served on the important and powerful Appropriations Committee for 14 years.

It is a fitting and appropriate tribute to designate the Federal building and U.S. courthouse located at 1205 Texas Avenue in Lubbock, TX, as the "George H. Mahon Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2532, a bill to designate the Federal building and U.S. courthouse in Lubbock, TX, as the "George H. Mahon Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

George Herman Mahon was born on September 22, 1900. He attended Simmons University and received his B.A. in 1924. He graduated from the Law Department of the University of Texas at Austin, receiving an L.L.B. in 1925. In the same year, he was admitted to the Texas Bar.

In November 1934, George Mahon was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives and served in each of the 21 succeeding Congresses.

During his tenure in Congress, George Mahon served with eight Presidents, served on the Committee on Appropriations for 14 years, and in May 1964, became its chairman until his retirement in 1978.

George Mahon served as a delegate to the Democratic National Convention from 1936-64. He also served as a regent of the Smithsonian Institution from 1964-78.

Mr. Mahon passed away in 1985.

It is fitting that the building in Lubbock, TX be named in honor of this outstanding legislator.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], who represents Mr. Mahon's district.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I obviously rise in support of H.R. 2532, as the original sponsor of that bill to name the Federal courthouse and building in Lubbock, TX, the George H. Mahon Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to the ranking member, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN], to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], the chairman of the full Committee on Public Works and Transportation, and to the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER].

Mr. Speaker, when the 19th District was formed in 1935, the first and only Member of Congress that represented the 19th District for 44 years was George Mahon. Mr. Mahon served as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations continuously, longer than any Member in the history of the House of Representatives. When he retired in 1978 he was the dean of the House of Representatives.

For years people in my district have made the suggestion that it would be most fitting to have the Federal building in Lubbock, TX, named after George Mahon. Today we are going to

begin to see the first major step in seeing that accomplished, and I think that is only appropriate.

When I first came to the Congress, Mr. Speaker, people always wanted to know where I was from. It was very easy for there to be a location placed upon my hometown. All I had to say was that I represented the seat that was George Mahon's. It does not matter that I am only the third Member that has represented that district in its entire history. No matter how many Members may follow me throughout the history of this country, Mr. Speaker, the 19th Congressional District of Texas will always be George Mahon's seat.

I appreciate the Chair's attention, I appreciate the fast action on this bill, and I would certainly urge support.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2532.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

A. MACEO SMITH FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2223) to designate the Federal building located at 525 Griffin Street in Dallas, Texas, as the "A. Maceo Smith Federal Building."

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2223

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building located at 525 Griffin Street in Dallas, Texas, is designated as the "A. Maceo Smith Federal Building".

SEC. 2. LEGAL REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, regulation, document, record, map, or other paper of the United States to the building referred to in section 1 is deemed to be a reference to the "A. Maceo Smith Federal Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] will be recog-

nized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I join the sponsor of the bill and subcommittee member, Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON in acknowledging the tremendous contributions made by Mr. Smith.

He was a revered and highly respected civil rights leader. His long productive public career included working with the Urban League, Fisk University, Bishop College, and with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Affairs.

It is a fitting and appropriate tribute to designate the Federal building located at 525 Griffin Street in Dallas, TX, as the "A. Maceo Smith Federal Building."

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of H.R. 2223.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2223, a bill to designate the Federal building located at 525 Griffin Street in Dallas, TX, as the "A. Maceo Smith Federal Building."

Antonio Maceo Smith was born April 16, 1903, in Texarkana, TX. He received a bachelor's degree from Fisk University and a master of business administration from New York University. He attended Columbia University for postgraduate study in economics and business law.

A. Maceo Smith served for 29 years as intergroup adviser for the Federal Housing Administrator for Equal Opportunity with the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

He participated in and headed many national and local organizations including the first African-American chairman of the Southwest Area YMCA Council, national president of the Alpha Phi Alpha fraternity, local president of the Dallas Urban League, national alumni president of Fisk University, and board member of Bishop College.

Mr. Smith passed away in 1977.

It is fitting that the Federal building in Dallas, TX, be named in honor of this outstanding civic leader. I urge enactment of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Smith helped to found the Dallas Negro Chamber of Commerce. He was active with the NAACP, and served as a national board member from 1953 to 1959. He was a member and national president of the Alpha Phi Alpha fraternity,

which is the oldest fraternity in the United States for African-American men based on scholarship.

This designation is warranted, and I am proud to support it. I urge passage of the bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have sponsored H.R. 2223, which will name an existing Federal Building in my congressional district for a great American and a great leader of the black community in Texas.

When this legislation is signed into law, the building at 525 Griffin Street in Dallas, TX, will be named the A. Maceo Smith Federal Building.

A. Maceo Smith was an early leader of the black community in Dallas. He earned distinction by fighting for civil rights while also leading the way for blacks to participate in the Texas economy. At the same time he worked tirelessly for racial harmony.

A well-educated man, A. Maceo Smith graduated from Fisk University and New York University. In Dallas, he served as a board member of many distinguished organizations which have promoted racial and religious harmony, such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; the national fraternity, Alpha Phi Alpha; and the Dallas Chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

In 1976 he was honored by the city of Dallas, which proclaimed, "A. Maceo Smith Day." Unfortunately, Mr. Smith departed this life on December 19, 1977.

It was his efforts to integrate blacks into the business and political communities which have marked his importance.

A. Maceo Smith helped create the Negro Chamber of Commerce in the early 1930's, and was an early organizer of black voters. He also founded the Progressive Voters League, which successfully increased the participation of more blacks in the political process.

It was through his involvement with the N.A.A.C.P. and Alpha Phi Alpha where Mr. Smith made some of his most lasting and important contributions.

As a leader of both organizations at the local level, he helped form a mutually beneficial working relationship between the two. As a recognition of his success in working with Alpha Phi Alpha, He was elected national president in 1969.

The Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity is the oldest fraternity for black American men based on scholarship. The fraternity proudly claims among its membership Adam Clayton Powell, Thurgood Marshall, Robert Weaver, and Vernon Jordan, as well as many, many other black American scholars in all professions.

Mr. Smith's leadership positions were instrumental when he moved to mend the extremely imbalanced racial situation which existed in Texas at the time. Among the injustices which he countered were a poll tax, the inability of blacks to vote in primary elections, and uneven salaries for black and white teachers.

It did not take Mr. Smith long to bring together the Dallas community to respond to these injustices. In the 1930's, he was part of a lawsuit which successfully overturned the poll tax.

In 1944, he was one of the leaders in the successful campaign and lawsuit for blacks to

secure the right to vote in Texas primary elections.

In 1945, Mr. Smith organized plaintiffs to file a lawsuit to equalize teachers' salaries among whites and blacks. At the time, there was a significant difference in the salaries which black teachers were paid, but Mr. Smith was successful in forcing the State of Texas to rectify this situation.

It is particularly gratifying that the Federal building which I intend to have named for Mr. Smith includes office space of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Mr. Smith was a long-time employee of HUD—a total of 34 years of public service. Probably his most significant contribution at the agency was his role as the Fair Housing Coordinator, where he began the process of desegregating Federal housing projects.

During the days in which Mr. Smith served, he had a built-in incentive to maintain the housing projects to the very best of his ability. You see, as a black man during the 1930's, he was not even permitted to have his office with the rest of his Federal housing colleagues. Rather, he was forced to run his office right out of the projects.

Although A. Maceo Smith died in 1977 at the age of 74, the purposeful manner in which he lived his life continues to benefit every black American in Dallas. It is fitting that A. Maceo Smith, a man who was first in many significant aspects, will be the first black American to have a Federal office building named in his honor in the city of Dallas.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the Members of this Congress will support my efforts to name this Federal building after an outstanding and distinguished American.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2223.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2223, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

POTTER STEWART UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2555) to designate the Federal building located at 100 East Fifth

Street in Cincinnati, Ohio, as the "Potter Stewart United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2555

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building located at 100 East Fifth Street in Cincinnati, Ohio, shall be known and designated as the "Potter Stewart United States Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Potter Stewart United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Potter Stewart was born January 23, 1915, in Jackson, MI, into a family of dedicated public servants. His father, James Garfield Stewart was mayor of Cincinnati and a member of the Ohio Supreme Court.

In 1954 at the age of 39, President Eisenhower appointed Potter Stewart to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. President Eisenhower also appointed him to a recess appointment as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. He was confirmed by the Senate in May 1959. Potter Stewart retired from the Supreme Court on July 3, 1981, after a long career noted for judicial excellence and fairness.

Judge Stewart died December 7, 1985, in Hanover, NH. It is fitting and proper to pay honor to the many contributions of Justice Potter Stewart by naming the Federal building located in Cincinnati, OH, as the "Potter Stewart United States Courthouse."

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2555, a bill to designate the building located at 100 East Fifth Street in Cincinnati, OH, as the "Potter Stewart United States Courthouse."

Potter Stewart was born January 23, 1915, in Jackson, MI. He was educated at Yale University and attended Yale Law School. He served in the U.S. Navy in World War II from 1942 to 1945 in active sea duty in the Atlantic, Caribbean, and the Mediterranean.

In 1954 at the age of 39, President Eisenhower appointed Potter Stewart to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth

Circuit. President Eisenhower also appointed him to a recess appointment as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Potter Stewart retired from the Court July 3, 1981, and died December 7, 1985, in Hanover, NH.

It is fitting that the Federal building in Cincinnati, OH be named in honor of this outstanding jurist. I urge enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN].

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] for yielding the time, and to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], my colleague and subcommittee chairman, for his assistance in moving this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I rise today in support of H.R. 2555, a bill which will recognize the enduring legacy of a distinguished Cincinnati native, the late Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, Potter Stewart. By designating the U.S. Post Office and courthouse building in Cincinnati, OH, the "Potter Stewart U.S. Courthouse Building," we pay tribute to a man of fine intellect who built his life on public service for the benefit of a nation.

President Ronald Reagan praised Justice Potter Stewart as a "patriot and a good lawyer—indeed a brilliant man of the law." And yes, he possessed all of those qualities and much more.

Justice Stewart devoted his life to serving city and country. He served his country in the U.S. Navy during the Second World War. He then served on Cincinnati's City Council and was vice-mayor. In 1954, he was named by President Eisenhower to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, which resides in the U.S. Post Office and courthouse building in Cincinnati. At the age of 39, Mr. Stewart became the youngest Federal judge in the country.

Following the retirement of Associate Justice Harold H. Burton, President Eisenhower appointed Judge Stewart to the Court during a congressional recess in October 1958, permitting him to join the Court before the Senate confirmed him the following May. At age 43, he was the second youngest Supreme Court appointee since before the Civil War.

Justice Stewart served on the Court for 23 years—during a period of major political, economic and social change in this country. He held that the first duty of a Justice was to prevent moral, philosophical and religious beliefs from clouding his or her interpretation of the principles of the Constitution. Neither a champion of the political left nor of the political right, Mr. Stewart focused on the merits of a case, but shunned broad social and economic interpretations of the law. Libertarians praised his support of the first amendment principles of free speech and free-

dom of the press. Conservatives commended him for his acceptance of prayer in school and for backing prosecutors and police in many criminal justice cases.

Following his retirement in 1981, Justice Stewart continued to devote time to his wonderful wife, Mary Anne, known as Andi; and to his children and grandchildren, while serving on presidential commissions, lecturing at law schools and volunteers to read textbooks to blind law students.

Upon his death in 1985, President George Bush called Justice Stewart "an outstanding man who was a symbol of decency and honor. He was a constitutional scholar who interpreted the Constitution without succumbing to the temptation to legislate from the bench."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to rename the U.S. courthouse in Cincinnati after Potter Stewart. His wisdom and pragmatic administration of the law during some of the momentous decisions of our time must not be forgotten. Enactment of H.R. 2555 would give lasting honor to a fine and brilliant son of Cincinnati.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to support the bill sponsored by the fine gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN] and I urge all Members to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2555.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2555, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

WATER RESOURCES CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2356) to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Army to carry out certain construction projects in the Virgin Islands.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2356

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 406 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (48 U.S.C. 1405c note; 104 Stat. 4646) is amended by striking subsection (c).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 2356, a bill to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Army to carry out Federal construction projects in the U.S. Virgin Islands. This bill is sponsored by the distinguished Congressman from the Virgin Islands, Mr. RON DELUGO.

In 1989, Hurricane Hugo devastated the U.S. Virgin Islands with winds of 200 miles per hour, causing an estimated \$1.8 billion in damages. The hardest hit island was St. Croix, which sustained hurricane-force winds for 12 hours causing total or significant damage to 90 percent of the island's structures.

To assist in the reconstruction of the islands' infrastructure, the government of the Virgin Islands sought authority for the Secretary of the Army to manage construction projects which were being financed with Federal assistance, including wastewater treatment facilities required under the Clean Water Act.

In the Water Resources Development Act of 1990, section 406, Congress authorized the Secretary of the Army, upon the request of the Governor, to carry out construction projects that receive Federal assistance and for the payments to be made directly from the Federal agency to the Secretary of the Army. Subsection (c) of section 406 terminates this authority 3 years after enactment, or November 28, 1993.

Several of the rebuilding projects have not been commenced. H.R. 2356 deletes the sunset in the present law and allows the Secretary to continue assisting in the rebuilding of the U.S. Virgin Islands.

I urge my colleagues to vote to join me in support of H.R. 2356.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1240

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 2356 which would extend the authority of the Secretary of the Army to carry out certain construction projects in the Virgin Islands.

In 1990, the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and the Congress authorized the Corps of Engineers to assist the government of the Virgin Islands in connection with federally funded projects.

That authority will expire in November of this year.

The Corps of Engineers has entered into a memorandum of understanding with EPA to undertake five work assignments for wastewater treatment and emergency preparedness improvements in the Virgin Islands.

Only one of the assignments will be under construction prior to the provision's November 28, 1993 expiration date requiring the Corps to suspend work on the other four projects.

This authority is similar to a general authority for the Secretary of the Army to provide reimbursable design and construction assistance to State and local governments for projects receiving Federal financial assistance.

I urge approval of the bill and commend the gentleman from the Virgin Islands for his work in bringing it to the Congress' attention.

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Water Resources Subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLEGATE] for his support of my bill and his help in bringing it to the floor. I also thank, Mr. FRANKS, the gentleman from New Jersey, for his support and that of the other minority members of the Public Works Committee.

This measure is very important to the Virgin Islands.

In September 1989, Hurricane Hugo, with its winds of almost 200 miles per hour knocked out virtually the entire infrastructure of the Virgin Islands.

To help rebuild its infrastructure, the Virgin Islands Government sought authorization for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to help manage construction projects that were financed through Federal assistance, including wastewater treatment facilities required under the Clean Water Act. This authority was provided for a period of 3 years to the corps in 1990 with respect to wastewater treatment facilities.

However, as you might understand, given the intensity of the storm, the reconstruction of these facilities involved major projects on St. Croix, St. Thomas, and St. John, which could not be completed in 3 years. There are still at least four major work assignments to be undertaken which will be funded by the EPA at an estimated cost of \$24 million for which the management services of the corps are needed.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, an extension of the corps' authority to provide these services is needed for an indefinite period. My bill, H.R. 2356 does that. It deletes the sunset in the present law and will continue the authority for the Secretary of the Army to assist the Virgin Islands in rebuilding its water treatment facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House to support this measure.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for

time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I too, want to commend the gentleman from the Virgin Islands [Mr. DE LUGO].

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2356.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2356, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MODIFYING PROJECT FOR FLOOD CONTROL, JAMES RIVER BASIN, RICHMOND, VA

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2824) to modify the project for flood control, James River Basin, Richmond, VA. The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2824

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. JAMES RIVER BASIN, RICHMOND, VIRGINIA.

The project for flood control, James River Basin, Richmond, Virginia, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4126) is modified to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct the project at a total cost of \$134,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$100,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$33,500,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 2824, a bill to increase the authorized cost of the James River Basin project to \$134 million.

The bill is sponsored by the capable gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], whom I am proud to support.

Mr. Speaker, the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 authorizes a flood control project for the James River basin, Richmond, VA. The project plan is to construct levees and floodwalls to protect the city's industrial and downtown areas. The total cost authorized in 1986 by Congress was \$91.8 million.

During the construction of the Richmond project, the corps discovered hazardous and toxic waste in one segment. The removal of lead, cadmium compounds, and petroleum products, along with expected inflationary impacts, have caused the project costs to increase to \$134 million.

The Water Resources Development Act of 1986, section 902, provides for an explicit limit to the cost increases which may be incurred in any water resources development project without further authorization by the Congress.

Project cost increases are limited to any modifications which do not materially alter the scope of the project and do not increase total project costs by more than 20 percent plus increases for inflation and for changes specifically authorized or required under Federal law. The current section 902 cost ceiling for the project is \$123 million, or \$11 million less than the current estimate of the cost to complete the authorized work.

If the hidden hazardous waste had not been present, the project could have been completed under its authorized cost.

The project is now about 98 percent complete. Raising the authorized cost will allow the project to be completed in a deliberate fashion. Of the cost, \$100.5 million is the Federal share; local sponsors will be responsible for the \$33.5 million non-Federal share under the regular cost-sharing rules.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 2824.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support passage of H.R. 2824 which would increase the authorization level of the Richmond flood control project.

Project costs have increased as a result of the discovery of toxic and hazardous substances at the site.

The current estimated cost to complete the project, \$134 million, exceeds the current statutorily imposed limit on the corps' ability to obligate funds—\$123 million.

The project is 98 percent complete but cannot be finished without an increase in the cost ceiling.

Unless we act soon, the project will be halted this fall.

The recent flooding in the Midwest graphically illustrated the consequences of leaving developed areas unprotected from flood waters.

Accordingly, I urge passage of this bill to allow the project to be completed.

I want to thank Chairman MINETA, as well as the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, Mr. APPLIGATE and Mr. BOEHLERT for expediting action on this needed bill.

I also commend the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. BLILEY, for his tireless work on an issue of tremendous importance to his constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY].

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support for H.R. 2824, legislation which raises the authorized spending level for the Richmond floodwall project to \$134,000,000. Passage of this legislation by Congress is necessary to get the project over a legal hurdle caused by the discovery of hazardous waste on the project site. The added cost of the environmental cleanup has triggered a legal spending ceiling that prevents any further spending on the project. This is not a question of not having the appropriate resources; it is a question of being legally able to spend the money that is dedicated to the project.

I want to thank the leadership of the Public Works and Transportation Committee—Chairmen MINETA and APPLIGATE along with ranking members SHUSTER and BOEHLERT have been quick to recognize the need for Congress to quickly solve this legal question. I applaud their commitment to this project and their skill in dealing with their committee's business so efficiently.

We have seen on the Mississippi what havoc a flood can bring to a community. Let's keep the Richmond floodwall project going. I again urge the House to adopt this legislation to allow the Richmond floodwall project to stay on schedule.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support the bill offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY]. As happens many times, we see these hazardous compounds produce additional costs. But this bill rectifies that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2824.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FISCAL YEAR 1994 AND 1995 BLM AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2530) to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to authorize appropriations for programs, functions, and activities of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, for fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2530

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND STATUTORY REFERENCE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Fiscal Year 1994 and 1995 BLM Authorization Act".

(b) STATUTORY REFERENCE.—As used in this Act, the term "the Act" means the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION AND FUTURE REAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Section 318(a) of the Act (43 U.S.C. 1748(a)) is amended by striking out "October 1, 1978" and by inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1995".

(b) FUTURE REAUTHORIZATIONS.—Section 318(b) of the Act is amended by striking "May 15, 1977, and not later than May 15 of each second even number year thereafter" and by inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1994, and January 1 of each second odd-number year thereafter".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

□ 1250

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2530, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2530, as reported by the Committee on Natural Resources.

This is a simple bill. It would amend the Bureau of Land Management's Organic Act in two ways:

To authorize appropriation of such sums as may be necessary for the Bureau of Land Management—BLM—to

discharge its primary responsibilities during fiscal years 1994 and 1995.

To require submission by January 1 of next year and periodically thereafter of formal requests for further authorizations of BLM funding.

The Bureau of Land Management is an important agency of Government. It is responsible for managing more than 270 million acres of land, and the minerals underlying another 300 million acres, that are the property of all the American people—more lands and minerals than any other Federal agency.

The basic law governing BLM is its Organic Act, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 [FLPMA]. That act provides for periodic reauthorization of appropriations for BLM to carry out its primary responsibilities for management of many millions of acres of lands and minerals from coast to coast.

Authorization for funding some BLM activities is provided by other statutes. One example is the program of payments to certain local governments in lieu of taxes.

But implementation of FLPMA is BLM's most important function, and for that the last BLM funding authorization expired at the end of fiscal year 1982.

Until this year, appropriations for BLM have continued, but only because appropriation bills were protected against points of order against these violations of the rules of the House.

This year, that was not the case, and in fact most funding for BLM was stripped from the appropriation bill when a point of order was raised here on the House floor, because of the absence of a BLM reauthorization.

In 1989 and again in 1991, the natural resources committee and the House tried to resolve this problem through passage of BLM reauthorization measures. Unfortunately, the Senate did not act on those bills.

Earlier this year, I introduced a 4-year BLM reauthorization bill similar to the one that our committee reported and the House passed in 1991. At our subcommittee hearing on that bill, BLM's new director, Mr. Baca, testified that the Clinton administration supported enactment of a 4-year reauthorization for BLM. However, he also indicated that the administration wanted to have an opportunity to develop detailed proposals for revisions to FLPMA that would strengthen BLM's ability to properly manage the public lands.

Accordingly, Director Baca suggested that in the meantime, consideration should be given to enactment of a short-term authorization bill.

In response, I introduced H.R. 2530 to provide a 1-year authorization for BLM for fiscal year 1994. In committee, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] offered an amendment to extend the authorization to cover fiscal year 1995 as

well. That amendment was adopted, and the bill as so amended was favorably reported from the Natural Resources Committee by a unanimous voice vote.

Prior to the August recess, we had prepared to bring the bill before the House under a rule that specifically made in order an amendment related to grazing fees. However, the bill was not taken up then, and as Members are aware the administration has now announced its intention to address grazing fees and range management reforms through administrative actions. Accordingly, in the interests of expediting action on this reauthorization measure, we are today bringing H.R. 2530 up on suspension rather than under a rule.

While we can never predict events in the other body, I am hopeful that this 2-year authorization is something that can be enacted without unnecessary delay.

Once this bill is enacted, the Natural Resources Committee, working with the administration, will have the opportunity to fashion a longer term measure that will extend the BLM authorization further and will increase BLM's ability to properly carry out its important responsibilities.

Meanwhile, I urge support for this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2530, the reauthorization of the Bureau of Land Management. As fully explained by Chairman VENTO, H.R. 2530 reauthorizes the BLM for a full 2 years. I commend the chairman for bringing to the floor a clean reauthorization bill that leaves other issues to stand on their own merit.

The BLM manages vast areas of the West including over 22 million acres in the State of Utah. It is important that the authorizing committee insure the stability of this agency by providing a long-term authorization. Although H.R. 2530 is only a 2-year authorization, it is the best BLM bill to come out of the Natural Resources Committee for some time. I hope our committee can address other issues regarding the mission of the BLM at a later date and independently of reauthorizing the agency.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2530.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the bill and thank my colleague, the ranking member, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] for his support and his amendment to this legislation, which we have accepted, which provides for a 2-year authorization, and which I think is realistic.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2530, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, as passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read:

A bill to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to authorize appropriations for programs, functions, and activities of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, for fiscal years 1994 and 1995, and for other purposes.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUINEBAUG AND SHETUCKET RIVERS VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR ACT OF 1993

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1348) to establish the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor in the State of Connecticut, and for other purposes and amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1348

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that.

(1) The Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley in the State of Connecticut is one of the last unspoiled and undeveloped areas in the Northeastern United States and has remained largely intact, including important aboriginal archaeological sites, excellent water quality, beautiful rural landscapes, architecturally significant mill structures and mill villages, and large acreage of parks and other permanent open space.

(2) The State of Connecticut ranks last among the 50 States in the amount of federally protected park and open space lands within its borders and lags far behind the other northeastern States in the amount of land set-aside for public recreation.

(3) The beautiful rural landscapes, scenic vistas and excellent water quality of the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers contain significant undeveloped recreational opportunities for people throughout the United States.

(4) The Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley is within a 2-hour drive of the major metropolitan areas of New York City, Hartford, Providence, Worcester, Springfield, and Boston. With the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors reporting that Americans are taking shorter "closer-to-home" vacations, the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley represents important close-by recreational opportunities for significant population.

(5) The existing mill sites and other structures throughout the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley were instrumental in the development of the industrial revolution.

(6) The Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley contains a vast number of discovered and unrecovered Native American and colonial archaeological sites significant to the history of North America and the United States.

(7) The Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley represents one of the last traditional upland farming and mill village communities in the northeastern United States.

(8) The Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley played a nationally significant role in the cultural evolution of the prewar colonial period. Leading the transformation from Puritan to Yankee, the "Great Awakening" religious revival and early political development leading up to and during the War of Independence.

(9) Many local, regional and State agencies, businesses, and private citizens and the New England Governors' Conference have expressed an overwhelming desire to combine forces to work cooperatively to preserve and enhance resources region-wide and better plan for the future.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF QUINEBAUG AND SHETUCKET RIVERS VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR; PURPOSE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established in the State of Connecticut the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act to provide a management framework to assist the State of Connecticut, its units of local and regional government and citizens in the development and implementation of integrated cultural, historical, and recreational land resource management programs in order to retain, enhance, and interpret the significant features of the lands, water, and structures of the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley in the State of Connecticut.

SEC. 4. BOUNDARIES AND ADMINISTRATION.

(a) BOUNDARIES.—The Boundaries of the Corridor shall include the towns of Ashford, Brooklyn, Canterbury, Chaplin, Coventry, Eastford, Franklin, Griswold, Hampton, Killingly, Lebanon, Lisbon, Mansfield, Norwich, Plainfield, Pomfret, Preston, Putnam, Scotland, Sprague, Sterling, Thompson, Voluntown, Windham, and Woodstock. As soon as practical after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register a detailed description and map of boundaries established under this subsection.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The Corridor shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 5. QUINEBAUG AND SHETUCKET RIVERS VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established within the Department of the Interior the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Commission (referred to in this Act as the "Commission"). The Commission shall assist appropriate Federal, State, regional planning organizations, and local authorities in the development and implementation of an integrated resource management plan for the lands and water as specified in section 3.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Commission shall be comprised of 19 members appointed not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act as follows:

(1) The Director of the National Park Service ex officio (or his delegate).

(2) 3 individuals appointed by the Secretary after consultation with the governor, who shall represent the interests of—

(A) the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection,

(B) the Connecticut Historical Commission, and

(C) the Connecticut Department of Economic Development;

(3) 6 individuals representing the interests of local government or regional planning organizations from Connecticut appointed by the Secretary after consultation with the Governor, of whom, 3 shall be representatives of the 3 regional planning organizations within the Corridor region and 3 shall be local elected officials from the region; and

(4) 9 individuals from the general public, who are citizens of the State of Connecticut, appointed by the Secretary, after consultation with the Governor, representing conservation, business, tourism, and recreational interests.

A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointments were made.

(c) **TERMS.**—(1) Members of the Commission shall be appointed for terms of 3 years and may be reappointed.

(2) Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term. Any member of the Commission appointed for a definite term may serve after the expiration of his term until his successor has taken office.

(d) **COMPENSATION.**—Members of the Commission shall receive no pay on account of their service on the Commission but while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(e) **CHAIRPERSON.**—The Chairperson of the Commission shall be elected by the members of the Commission.

(f) **QUORUM.**—(1) 8 members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold hearings.

(2) The affirmative vote of not less than 10 members of the Commission shall be required to approve the budget of the Commission.

(g) **MEETINGS.**—The Commission shall hold its first meeting not later than 90 days after the date on which its members are appointed, and shall meet at least quarterly at the call of the chairperson or 10 of its members. Meetings of the Commission shall be subject to section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code (relating to open meetings).

(h) **PROXY.**—Any member of the Commission may vote by means of a signed proxy exercised by another member of the Commission, but any member so voting shall not be considered present for purposes of establishing a quorum.

SEC. 6. STAFF OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix compensation of such staff as may be necessary to carry out its duties.

(2) Staff appointed by the Commission—

(A) shall be appointed subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service; and

(B) shall be paid in accordance with provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(b) **EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.**—Subject to such rules as may be adopted by the Commission, the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates determined by the Commission to be reasonable.

(c) **STAFF OF OTHER AGENCIES.**—(1) Upon request of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out the Commission's duties.

(2) The Commission may accept the service of personnel detailed from the State, any political subdivision and regional planning organizations, and may reimburse the State, political subdivision, and regional planning organizations for those services.

SEC. 7. POWERS OF COMMISSION.

(a) **HEARING.**—(1) The Commission may, for the purposes of carrying out this Act, hold hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence, as the Commission considers appropriate.

(2) The Commission may not issue subpoenas or exercise any subpoena authority.

(b) **POWERS OF MEMBERS AND AGENTS.**—Any member or agent of the Commission, if so authorized by the Commission, may take any action which the Commission is authorized to take by this Act.

(c) **ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.**—The Administrator of the General Services Administration shall provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis, such administrative support services as the Commission may request.

(d) **MAILS.**—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and other agencies of the United States.

(e) **USE OF FUNDS TO OBTAIN MONEY.**—The Commission may use its funds to obtain money from any source under any program or law requiring the recipient of such money to make a contribution in order to receive such money.

(f) **GIFTS.**—Except as provided in subsection (g)(2)(B), the Commission may, for purposes of carrying out its duties, seek, accept, and dispose of gifts, bequests, or donations of money, personal property, or services, received from any source: Provided, That such gifts are used for public purposes.

(g) **ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.**—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) and except with respect to any leasing of facilities under subsection (c), the Commission may not acquire any real property or interest in real property.

(2) Subject to paragraph (3), the Commission may acquire real property or interest in real property in the Corridor—

(A) by gift or devise; or

(B) by purchase from a willing seller with money that was given, appropriated, or bequeathed to the Commission on the condition that such money would be used to purchase real property, or interest in real property, in the Corridor.

(3) Any real property or interest in real property acquired by the Commission under paragraph (2) shall be conveyed by the Commission to an appropriate public or private land management agency, as determined by

the Commission. Any such conveyance shall be made—

(A) as soon as practicable after such acquisition;

(B) without consideration; and

(C) on the condition that the real property or interest in real property so conveyed is used for public purposes.

(h) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—For purposes of carrying out the plan, the Commission may enter into cooperative agreements with the State of Connecticut, with any political subdivision, or with any person or organization. Any such cooperative agreement shall, at a minimum, establish procedures for providing notice to the Commission of any action proposed by the State, such political subdivision, or such person which may affect implementation of the plan referred to in section 8.

SEC. 8. DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) **PREPARATION OF PLAN.**—Within 2 years after the Commission conducts its first meeting, it shall submit to the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of Connecticut for review and approval of Cultural Heritage and Corridor Management Plan. The Plan shall be based on existing Federal, State, and local plans, but shall coordinate those plans and present a unified historic preservation, interpretation, and recreational plan for the Corridor. The plan shall—

(1) provide an inventory which includes any property in the Corridor which should be preserved, restored, managed, developed, maintained, or acquired because of its national historic or cultural or recreational significance;

(2) recommend advisory standards and criteria applicable to the construction, preservation, restoration, alteration, and use of all properties within the Corridor;

(3) develop an historic interpretation plan to interpret the history of the Corridor;

(4) develop an inventory which includes existing and potential recreational sites which are developed or which could be developed along the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers and their surrounding areas;

(5) recommend policies for resource management which consider and detail application of appropriate land and water management techniques, including but not limited to, the development of inter-governmental cooperative arguments to protect the Corridor's historical, cultural, recreational, scenic, and natural resources in a manner consistent with supporting appropriate and compatible economic revitalization efforts;

(6) detail ways in which local, State, and Federal programs may best be coordinated to promote the purposes of this Act; and

(7) contain a program for implementation of the Plan by the State and its political subdivisions.

(b) **IMPLEMENTATION OF PLAN.**—After review and approval of the Plan by the Secretary and the Governor as provided in subsection (a), the Commission shall implement the Plan by taking appropriate steps to preserve and interpret the historic resources, develop the recreational resources of the Corridor and its surrounding area, and to support public and private efforts in economic revitalization, consistent with the goals of the Plan. These steps may include, but need not be limited to—

(1) assisting the State and local governmental entities or regional planning organizations, and non-profit organizations in preserving the Corridor and ensuring appropriate use of lands and structures throughout the Corridor;

(2) assisting the State and local governmental entities or regional planning organizations, and non-profit organizations in establishing, and maintaining visitor centers

and other interpretive exhibits in the Corridor;

(3) assisting the State and local governmental entities or regional planning organizations, and non-profit organizations in developing recreational programs and resources in the Corridor;

(4) assisting the State and local governmental entities or regional planning organizations, and non-profit organizations in increasing public awareness of and appreciation for the historical and architectural resources and sites in the Corridor;

(5) assisting the State and local governmental or regional planning organizations and nonprofit organizations in the restoration of any historic building in the Corridor;

(6) encouraging by appropriate means enhanced economic and industrial development in the Corridor consistent with the goals of the Plan;

(7) encouraging local governments to adopt land use policies consistent with the management of the Corridor and the goals of the Plan, and to ensure appropriate use of lands and structures throughout the Corridor; and

(8) assisting the State and local governmental entities or regional planning organizations to ensure that clear, consistent signs identifying access points and sites of interest are put in place throughout the Corridor.

SEC. 9. TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.

(a) **TERMINATION.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Commission shall terminate on the day occurring 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **EXTENSION.**—The Commission may be extended for a period of not more than 5 years beginning on the day of termination referred to in subsection (a) if, not later than 180 days before such day—

(1) the Commission determines such extension is necessary in order to carry out the purposes of this Act;

(2) the Commission submits such proposed extension to the Committee on Natural Resources of the United States House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate; and

(3) the Secretary, in consultation with the Governor of Connecticut, approves such extension.

SEC. 10. DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.

(a) **APPROVAL OF PLAN.**—The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Governor of Connecticut, shall approve or disapprove a Plan submitted under this Act by the Commission not later than 60 days after receiving such Plan. The Secretary, in consultation with the Governor, shall approve a Plan submitted if—

(1) they find the Plan, if implemented, would adequately protect significant historical and cultural resources of the Corridor while providing adequate and appropriate outdoor recreational opportunities and economic activities within the Corridor;

(2) they determine that the Commission held public hearings and provided adequate opportunity for public and governmental involvement in the preparation of the Plan; and

(3) the Secretary receives adequate assurances from appropriate State officials that the recommended implementation program identified in the Plan will be initiated within a reasonable time after date of approval of the Plan, and that such implementation program will ensure effective implementation of the State and local aspects of the Plan.

(b) **DISAPPROVAL OF PLAN.**—If the Secretary disapproves a Plan submitted to him by the Commission, he shall advise the Com-

mission in writing of the reasons therefor and shall make recommendations for revisions in the Plan. The Commission shall within 90 days of receipt of such notice of disapproval revise and resubmit the plan to the Secretary who shall approve or disapprove a proposed revision within 60 days after the date it is submitted to him.

(c) **ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary of the Interior shall, upon request of the Commission, assist the Commission in the preparation and implementation of Plan.

SEC. 11. DUTIES OF OTHER FEDERAL ENTITIES.

Any Federal entity conducting or supporting activities directly affecting the Corridor shall—

(1) consult with the Secretary and the Commission with respect to such activities;

(2) cooperate with the Secretary and the Commission with respect to such activities and, to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate such activities; and

(3) to the maximum extent practicable, conduct or support such activities in a manner which the Commission determines will not have an adverse effect on the Corridor.

SEC. 12. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **COMMISSION.**—There is authorized to be appropriated \$200,000 for fiscal year 1994 and \$250,000 annually to the Commission to carry out its duties under this Act except that the Federal contributions to the Commission shall not exceed 50 percent of the annual costs to the Commission in carrying out those duties.

(b) **SECRETARY.**—There are authorized to be appropriated annually to the Secretary such sums as may be necessary to carry out his duties under this Act.

SEC. 13. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "Commission" means the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Commission established under section 5.

(2) The term "State" means the State of Connecticut.

(3) The term "Corridor" means the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor established under section 3.

(4) The term "Plan" means the Cultural Heritage and Corridor Management Plan to be prepared by the Commission pursuant to section 8.

(5) The term "Governor" means the Governor of the State of Connecticut.

(6) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(7) The term "regional planning organization" means each of the 3 regional planning organizations established by Connecticut State statute chapter 127 and chapter 50 (the Northeast Council of Governments, the Windham Regional Planning Agency or its successor, and the Southeastern Connecticut Regional Planning Agency or its successor).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material,

on H.R. 1348, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1348 establishes the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor which incorporates 25 local towns in the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley in Connecticut.

The Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley in northeastern Connecticut includes natural landscapes, parks, and other open spaces as well as mill villages, some native American and colonial archeological sites, and sites associated with the great awakening religious revival in colonial New England.

In January 1989, the National Park Service began a study of the feasibility and suitability of establishing the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley Heritage Corridor in northeastern Connecticut. The legislation before us is based on matters reviewed as part of that study.

H.R. 1348 provides for a 19-member Commission which, with the assistance of the Secretary of the Interior, would develop and assist with the implementation of a management plan for the corridor, the purpose of which would be to protect and preserve the cultural, historical, and recreational resources of the valley. This bill authorizes the appropriation of \$200,000 for fiscal year 1994 and \$250,000 thereafter annually to the Commission; Federal contributions to the Commission could not exceed 50 percent of the annual cost to the Commission for carrying out its duties.

The Commission's primary purpose will be to prepare and assist in implementing a plan to assist appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies in preserving and interpreting the historic and recreational resources of the canal and surrounding area. This plan should enhance existing policies and programs within the corridor and provide a focus to maximize preservation and interpretive efforts.

The committee has worked with the National Park Service to craft a bill acceptable to both. Amendments approved by the committee address the concerns of the National Park Service, and changes made in this substitute address the concerns voiced by the Justice Department over the appointments to the Commission provided for in this bill. The amendment substitutes language addressing this concern by providing for the appointment of members by the Secretary after consultation with the Governor, and requires the appointment of individuals representing the interests of the three named Connecticut agencies.

I was able to visit this area recently, and was impressed both with the resources and with the amount of work

the local officials and citizens have done to develop this proposal. Obviously, there is a great deal of support in the area for Federal assistance, but there is no indication that large-scale Federal involvement will be needed or even welcomed. H.R. 1348 provides for an appropriate and workable partnership between the National Park Service and State and local agencies and individuals. I believe this bill will protect and preserve the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley resources, and I urge my colleagues' support.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to H.R. 1348, the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers National Heritage Corridor bill. As fully explained by Chairman VENTO, this bill will create a heritage corridor in the State of Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, the National Park Service issued a draft study in April 1993 that found:

The Quinebaug-Shetucket region is not recommended for inclusion in the National Park System. The historic, natural and recreation resources make the QSR distinct from other parts of Connecticut, but do not reflect national significance.

I firmly believe that the National Park Service currently manages more than their resources can accommodate. We certainly should not be adding new areas when the Park Service itself does not recommend the area as a national heritage corridor.

I recommend that this body take a closer look at heritage corridors and fully evaluate the policy of creating these corridors over vast areas that include towns, cities, and industry. I am not opposed to these corridors but I do question whether it is a function of the National Park Service.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I take the words of my colleague as spoken with regard to the heritage corridor issue as one that I am extremely concerned about. I am concerned about the policy path that we have been on and I would hold out to him an ability and willingness to work with him to try and prescribe and define exactly what our legislative policy should be. I certainly intend to do so with a number of other proposals, as the gentleman knows, of this nature. I think this one is appropriate, and I would ask for the Members' support today.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Act. This bill passed the House in the 102d Congress and I urge my colleagues to support this important and long overdue legislation once again.

National heritage corridor designation will establish a management framework that will assist local and State governments, Federal agencies and private groups in preserving and

protecting one of the most culturally, recreationally, and environmentally unique and significant areas in the United States.

Many of the resources that this legislation seeks to protect are under constant threat of degradation and destruction as a result of developmental pressures. As the suburbs surrounding cities like Hartford, New York, and Boston expand, some of the last remaining tracts of open space in Connecticut as well as valuable archeological, historical, and recreational sites become vulnerable. I believe we have to take steps to safeguard these areas before they are lost forever.

Mr. Speaker, the area surrounding the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers is one of national significance. The mill structures and villages that can be found along the rivers chronicle the development of the textile industry in the United States. From the earliest and simplest mills to the grand structures of the late 19th and early 20th century, one can see the progression of an industry that was once one of this country's most important. The area also contains many discovered and undiscovered native American and colonial archeological sites. These sites have provided us with valuable insight into the lives of the native peoples who populated the area before the arrival of the Pilgrims. We have also learned much about our colonial ancestors who were among the Founders of this great Nation. The Quinebaug and Shetucket River Valley represents one of the most important areas of American cultural evolution during the pre-Revolutionary War era, leading the transformation from Puritan to Yankee and playing an important role in the "Great Awakening" religious revival.

For many years, I have been working with State and local governments and private groups in an effort to preserve and protect this unique area. In 1988, as chairman of the Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I conducted a field hearing to assess the need for additional parks, recreation areas, and open space in Connecticut. The hearing also examined options for preservation, whether they be State efforts, private efforts, Federal efforts, or some combination.

In that hearing, we learned a great deal about the mood of the residents, the area's important resources and what preservation options might work and their limitations both financially and technically. The most important thing we learned was that the residents were very concerned about the lack of parks, open space, and recreation areas as well as the disappearance of cultural and historical resources that give Connecticut its unique qualities. All 23 witnesses drawn from the environmental, government, and business communities that appeared or submitted testimony, agreed that the potential loss of important, cultural, natural, and historic resources had to be addressed.

We also learned that Connecticut lags far behind the rest of the northeast in the amount of land set aside for public recreation. The Northeastern States have an average of about 300 acres of public recreation land per 1,000 residents. In Connecticut, we have about 100 acres per 1,000 residents. In addition, Connecticut ranks last among the 50 States in the

amount of Federal lands such as national parks, forests, and wilderness areas within its borders. Until 1991, when the Weir Farm in Wilton and Ridgefield was established as a national historic site, Connecticut had no national park units. Today, with the existence of the Weir Farm, the National Park Service manages 2 acres in the entire State of Connecticut.

At the hearing, we also learned much about the management framework that the residents of Connecticut would be comfortable with. It became quite clear that people wanted to maintain as much local control as possible. This is much the same sentiment that was expressed more than 20 years ago when Senator Abraham Ribicoff proposed creating a national recreation area at the mouth of the Connecticut River. Residents' concern about the Federal Government taking control of the land defeated the project. Such concerns are as strong today as they were 20 odd years ago.

However, Congress and the National Park Service have devised an innovative, cost effective, and cooperative approach to natural resource protection called the national heritage corridor. The Illinois and Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor established in 1984, the Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor established in 1986, and the Delaware and Lehigh Navigation Canal National Heritage Corridor established in 1988, provide excellent models for cooperative Federal, State, local, and private partnerships for protecting important cultural, historic, and natural resources.

This concept is even more appealing because it does not call for the National Park Service to take title to the land. In today's budgetary climate, the creation of new national parks may be difficult to justify. In addition, many residents are opposed to such acquisition. Under this concept, local residents retain control over the land and the National Park Service acts as a technical adviser to local governments and private groups.

Mr. Speaker, this approach has overwhelming local support. Officials in the towns that would be included in the corridor are enthusiastic about the plan. Each of the three regional planning agencies in the area, the Northeast Council of Governments, the Windham Regional, and the Southeastern Connecticut Regional Planning Agencies, have expressed their support for national heritage corridor designation. The public interest and support has been simply overwhelming. Over Columbus Day weekend, 1991, we held a series of walking tours along the rivers and of many of the historic sites, archeological digs and other interpretative events. Mr. Speaker, almost 4,000 people turned out over the course of the weekend to participate in these events. A similar event in 1992 drew equally impressive numbers and plans are already being formulated for this year and 1994. During the more than 3 years of effort to establish a heritage corridor, interest and support in the community has never waned.

During the course of investigating ways to protect the region's valuable assets, we looked at various local, State and Federal preservation programs, but found them to be unacceptable or lacking important components. In particular, we considered the Wild

and Scenic River Program, but found it to be inadequate and too restrictive for our needs. Due to the quarter-mile boundary requirements associated with it, the program would have precluded much of the economic development opportunities near the rivers that are an important component of the area's current and future economy. Moreover, it would have given significant control of eastern Connecticut's lands and waters to the Federal Government at the expense of the local community.

In pursuit of other options, I requested that the National Park Service conduct a study of the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley to determine whether the area was suitable for heritage corridor designation. Staff toured the area and determined that it had great potential for recreation and site interpretation due to the presence of historic mill structures, mill villages, and scenic landscapes, but that further study was required to adequately determine the area's potential for further designation. A draft study was completed by the North Atlantic Region office of the National Park Service in March 1991, and it was submitted to the Service's Washington office.

In April 1993 the Park Service released the report which recognized the unique combination of cultural, historic, and natural resources found in the Quinebaug and Shetucket area. The report described the national significance of the region in the following manner:

This region represents a cross section of much of New England history—and, as so much of New England's history set the pattern and laid the foundation for the nation as a whole, it is a 24-town laboratory where one can observe the major trends of American development.

The report further concluded that the region was among the last in all of New England to retain the evidence of historical development clearly on the landscape. The report made it clear that the area contains important resources that chronicle American development which have disappeared in other areas. I believe heritage corridor designation will prevent the valuable resources in this area from being destroyed like they have been in so many other parts of the country.

During a hearing before the Natural Resources Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands, National Park Service Associate Director Denis Galvin expressed the Service's support for this legislation. Associate Director Galvin stressed that the partnerships established in this bill would assist local communities and residents preserve and protect the resources around them. He went on to comment that the other heritage corridors across the country were accomplishing their multifaceted goals of preservation, recreational and economic development, and education. I had the pleasure of giving Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt a tour of the area. He was impressed with the combination of cultural and natural resources. He also expressed strong support for the local, State, Federal, and private partnerships which this bill will create. He is very much in favor of these innovative concepts which show that preservation and economic development can go hand in hand.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation would establish the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor covering 600

square miles in 25 towns in eastern Connecticut. The bill would create a Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Commission. The Commission would be made up of 19 people including the Director of the National Park Service, State and local government officials, and individuals from the general public representing conservation, business, tourism, and recreational interests. The Commission would have 2 years to develop a cultural heritage and corridor management plan for the area that would coordinate existing Federal, State, and local plans for preserving and protecting cultural, natural, and historic resources. The plan would include an inventory of the cultural, historic, and natural resources sites to be preserved and protected, and set standards for the construction, preservation, restoration, and use of the resources within the corridor. The plan would also provide an inventory of the existing and potential recreational sites along the rivers and detail ways in which Federal, State, and local programs could be coordinated. Throughout the planning process, the Commission could draw on the technical expertise of the National Park Service or any other Federal agency.

The cultural heritage and corridor management plan must be approved by the Secretary of Interior after consultation with the Governor of Connecticut. Once approved, the Commission will take steps to implement the plan. The Commission can assist State and local government, and regional planning agencies in developing plans for appropriate use of land and structures. Visitor and interpretation centers will be established and recreational programs will be set up. Efforts will be undertaken to increase public awareness of the historical and archaeological resources and sites in the corridor.

The Commission will also encourage economic development consistent with the goals of the plan. We now realize that economic development and natural resource protection can go hand in hand. Also, in a time of defense cutbacks and lingering recession, we have been made painfully aware of the need for economic diversification. The recreational opportunities along the rivers, as well as the historic sites, could play an important role in boosting the growing tourism industry in Connecticut. New business could be attracted to the region due to the high quality of life afforded the area's residents as a result of national heritage corridor protection. By combining the expertise of the National Park Service and the regional knowledge of the local participants, I believe the Commission could establish standards that balance environmental protection and economic development.

Mr. Speaker, some may contend that the area was not the first industrial area, that it is not the most important recreational area, and that it does not contain the most fascinating archaeological sites. While one can argue that, I believe what makes the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley so important is the unique combination of resources found there.

In addition, I would like to make a point that I believe many of my friends from the East, and the West, can appreciate. Because the Eastern part of this country was developed first, most of its open space has been developed and population densities are among the

highest in the Nation. We don't have hundreds of thousands of acres that can be set aside like the great national parks on the West. Moreover, as pointed out in a New York Times story in July 1992, many individuals and families on the east coast cannot afford to travel to crown jewel parks like Yellowstone and Grand Canyon. Some of the few parks located near urban centers, such as Gateway located in part of New York City and New Jersey, have seen attendance skyrocket over the last few years as Americans have taken vacations closer to home. The Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor, located less than 2 hours from New York, Boston, Providence, and Hartford, could provide another place of natural and historical significance for the people of the east coast to visit. The positive impacts of the designation extend well beyond the borders of Connecticut.

I would like to comment again on the local support this proposal enjoys. As I mentioned earlier, Walking Weekends have been attended by thousands of people. Residents across eastern Connecticut enthusiastically support the creation of a national heritage corridor and are anxious to make it a reality. A dedicated group of more than 50 people now sit on the Quinebaug and Shetucket National Heritage Corridor Committee. Committee members have been instrumental in developing this legislation, planning for the area and bringing us to where we are today. This is truly a grassroots effort which has united the people of this area.

Mr. Speaker, designation of the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor is an extremely important measure. Through this bill, we will be able to protect some of the last remaining open space in Connecticut as well as historic mill structures and other buildings that chronicle colonial and industrial history of the United States. This legislation will allow local communities the control they so strongly believe in and free the Federal Government from the burden of costly land acquisition. Furthermore, this legislation will promote economic development and diversification in conjunction with natural resource protection. Finally, it will establish a framework for local, State, and Federal partnerships that will become increasingly important as the resources of each becomes more limited. I am pleased to have this legislation come before the House and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1348, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UTAH SCHOOLS AND LANDS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1993

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the House amendment to the Senate bill (S. 184) "to provide for the exchange of certain lands within the State of Utah, and for other purposes."

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments to House amendment:
Page 6, line 16 of the House engrossed amendment, strike out [\$25,000,000] and insert: \$50,000,000

Page 10, after line 24 of the House engrossed amendment, insert:

(3) *Transfer of any mineral interests to the State of Utah shall be subject to such conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe to ensure due diligence on the part of the State of Utah to achieve the timely development of such resources.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on S. 184, the Senate bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 184, the Utah Schools and Lands Improvement Act, is the companion bill to one sponsored in the House by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD].

The bill would make it possible for the United States to acquire most State-owned inholdings in the Utah units of the National Park System and the National Forest System and in two Indian reservations, in exchange for a combination of lands, minerals, and money. The effect would be to improve the management of the Federal and Indian lands, while assisting the State to increase funding for its public schools.

As originally passed by the Senate, the bill was similar but not identical to a version that the House passed last year. Last month, the Natural Resources Committee approved the bill with several amendments intended to bring it closer to the 1992 House bill, and the House passed the bill with those amendments just before the August break.

After the House action, Ms. SHEPHERD interceded to resolve the remaining differences between the House and Senate on this matter, and to achieve

final passage of this very important bill.

Because of such efforts, we were able to reach an agreement, and the Senate has since returned the bill to us with two further amendments, which we are proposing to accept so that the bill can be sent to President Clinton for signature and enacted.

The first Senate amendment would revise the limits on the total amount of royalties, from existing mineral leases, that could be received by the State as part of the overall exchange. Under this Senate amendment, these royalties could not exceed either 50 percent of the total value of the State lands that are transferred to the National Government, or \$50 million, whichever is less. The House had provided for a limit of \$25 million.

The bill requires the Secretary of the Interior to offer the State some additional royalties from existing mineral leases, as part of the overall exchange, but the total amount of such royalties to be offered is left to the discretion of the Secretary. The limit on that discretion is a ceiling, not a floor. The effect of the first Senate amendment we are agreeing to here is merely to raise that ceiling, and to give the Secretary an additional measure of discretion in fashioning the offer to be made to the State.

The second amendment would add to the bill a requirement that the transfer to the State of mineral interests—that is, the specified coal deposits—would be subject to due diligence requirements to assure that there will be a timely development of those minerals. I believe these changes are acceptable.

Adding an explicit due diligence requirement is significant because under the bill there is a requirement for interest payments by the United States with respect to any outstanding balance owed to the State until the State has received the full value of the lands and interests transferred to the United States and any mineral rights revert to the United States. Thus, it is important that the State proceed with due diligence to develop any minerals it receives under the exchange, so as to avoid any unnecessary duration of any interest payments that might be related to those minerals, if in fact any should be.

The Secretary will prescribe the terms of the due diligence requirements, including the effects of non-compliance. Certainly, if interest payments would otherwise be relevant, suspension of such interest payments might well be a most appropriate result of any failure by the State to exercise the required due diligence, and it is my expectation that the Secretary will take this into consideration in implementing this provision.

Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate the leadership and hard work of the gentleman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD] on

this bill. Her dedication and persistence were indispensable. She enabled us to reach an agreement that will be in the best interests of both the State of Utah—especially its schoolchildren—and the Nation. I also want to thank the ranking member of our subcommittee. Mr. HANSEN, for his valuable help and cooperation on this matter.

I urge the House to concur in the Senate amendments and thus send the bill to President Clinton for signature into law.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 184, the Utah school trust lands bill. Our action today represents final passage of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, S. 184 is not perfect in everyone's eyes but it does represent compromise by many divergent groups. I want the citizens of Utah and the Members of this body to know that S. 184 is a value for value land exchange. Regardless of what some critics might say, the State of Utah will receive full value for the school trust lands it is trading to the Federal Government. Whether it be through cash royalty payments or through exchanged land, the school children will receive full value for their land with the assurance that these lands will bring greater future returns for the schools of our State.

Mr. Speaker, I have been working on this issue for years and I am proud that we have finally found a solution that helps guarantee the future of Utah's schoolchildren. I want to thank the present Utah delegation for their work but I especially want to thank those who have worked since the 1970's to provide for the profitable management of our school trust lands.

Mr. Speaker, years ago, when I was in the State legislature, and later, as speaker of the house, I remember the Governor of the State was a Democrat by the name of Scott Mathison, and Governor Mathison came to us and said, "There's got to be some way. We have got to put these lands together." As most people who understand the West know, it is a checkerboard type of land, and we called that project "bold." It truly was a project bold, to try to work together and take all these pieces, put State in one area, and Federal in another area, and private in another. Unfortunately Scott did not live to see this come to pass, but in his memory we are grateful that we were able to do this.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues' support of S. 184 and look forward to its final passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I note that the gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD] has passed along her statement to me. I know she is attending the same program we did at the White House in terms of recognizing the momentous signing and first step towards peace between Israel and the Palestinian nationals, and I know that she will be back. I will submit her statement for the RECORD and again commend my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Ms. SHEPHERD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to speak in support of the Utah Schools and Lands Improvement Act of 1993. I would like to thank the chairman for his instrumental help in bringing this bill to the floor today. The kind of bi-partisan and bicameral unity that has worked creatively and diligently to bring this legislation before us today is nothing short of inspirational. It would be my hope that this harmony could be repeated again and again both in matters uniquely related to the people of Utah but also on some of the pressing concerns of our Nation.

This is an important and historic bill for the State of Utah. It will translate into many millions of dollars for Utah's school children and consistent, integrated management of our wondrous national parks.

Mr. Speaker, Utah has waited a long time for a solution to this difficult and often polarizing dilemma. I look forward to final passage for this bill today.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the House amendment to the Senate bill, S. 184.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the Senate amendments to the House amendment were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GALLATIN RANGE CONSOLIDATION AND PROTECTION ACT OF 1993

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 873) to provide for the consolidation and protection of the Gallatin Range.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be referred to as the "Gallatin Range Consolidation and Protection Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the lands north of Yellowstone National Park possess outstanding natural characteris-

tics and wildlife habitats that give the lands high value as lands added to the National Forest System; and

(2) it is in the interest of the United States for the Secretary, acting through the Forest Service, to enter into an option agreement with Big Sky Lumber Company and Louisiana Pacific Corporation to fulfill the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. BIG SKY LUMBER LAND EXCHANGE—GALLATIN AREA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture (referred to in this Act as the "Secretary"), unless the context otherwise requires) shall acquire by exchange certain lands and interests in lands of the Big Sky Lumber Company (referred to in this Act as the "Company"), in and adjacent to the Hyalite-Porcupine-Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study Area, the Scapegoat Wilderness Area, and other lands in the Gallatin National Forest in accordance with this section.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LANDS.—

(1) OFFER AND ACCEPTANCE OF LAND.—If the Company offers to the United States acceptable fee title, including mineral interests, to approximately 37,752 acres of land owned by the Company and available for exchange, as depicted on two maps entitled "Proposed BSL Land Acquisitions", East Half and West Half Gallatin National Forest, dated February 1993 the Secretary shall accept a warranty deed to the land.

(2) EXCHANGE.—In exchange for the lands described in paragraph (1) and subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary of the Interior shall convey, by patent, the fee title to approximately 16,278 acres of National Forest System lands available for exchange as depicted on the maps referred to in paragraph (1), and the five maps entitled "H.R. 873, the Gallatin Range Consolidation and Protection Act of 1993", Lolo and Flathead National Forest, subject to—

(A) the reservation of ditches and canals required by the first section of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and ninety-one, and for other purposes", approved August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 371, chapter 837; 43 U.S.C. 945);

(B) the reservation of rights under Federal Oil and Gas Lease numbers 49739, 55610, 40389, 53670, 40215, 33385, 53736, and 38684; and

(C) such other terms, conditions, reservations, and exceptions as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the Company.

(3) TERMINATION OF LEASES.—

(A) VESTING OF RIGHTS AND INTERESTS.—Upon termination or relinquishment of the leases referred to in paragraph (2)(B), all the rights and interests in such leases reserved under paragraph (2)(B) shall immediately vest in the Company and its successors and assigns.

(B) NOTICE.—The Secretary shall provide notice of the termination or relinquishment of the leases referred to in paragraph (2)(B) by a document suitable for recording in the county in which the leased lands are located.

(c) EASEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Reciprocal easements in accordance with this subsection shall be conveyed at the time of the exchange authorized by this section.

(2) CONVEYANCE BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall, in consideration of the easements conveyed by the Company under paragraph (3), and under the authority of Section 2 of Public Law 88-257 (commonly known as the "National Forest Roads and Trails Act") (16 U.S.C. 533), or the Federal Lands Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), execute and deliver to the Company such easements or other rights-of-way over federally owned lands as may be agreed to by the Secretary and the Company.

(3) CONVEYANCE BY THE COMPANY.—The Company shall, in consideration of the easements conveyed by the Secretary under paragraph (2), execute and deliver to the United States such easements or other rights-of-way across Company-owned lands included in this exchange as may be agreed to by the Secretary and the Company.

(d) NORTH BRIDGER RANGE.—

(1) COVENANTS AND OTHER RESTRICTIONS.—As a condition of the exchange, with respect to such lands depicted on the map entitled "North Bridger Range", dated May 1993, the Company shall agree that—

(A) the holders, or their successors or assigns, of grazing leases on such lands on the date of enactment of this Act shall be permitted to continue to use such lands for grazing under terms acceptable to the Company and the permittees for so long as the Company owns such lands and for two years after the Company has sold or disposed of such lands; and

(B) the timber harvest practices used on such lands shall be conducted in accordance with Montana Forestry Best Management Practices, the Montana Streamside Zone Management Law (Mont. Code Ann. sec. 77-5-301 et seq.), and all other applicable laws of the State of Montana.

(2) FUTURE ACQUISITION.—The Secretary shall consider the desirability of possible acquisition, through exchange under existing law, of any of the lands described in paragraph (1), and shall, not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, report to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives concerning the desirability of an exchange.

(e) TIMING OF TRANSACTION.—

(1) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall review the title for the non-Federal lands described in subsection (b), and the appraisal and titles for the non-Federal lands described in sections 4 and 5, and, within sixty days after receipt of all applicable appraisal and title documents from the Company, determine whether—

(A) the applicable title standards for Federal land acquisition have been satisfied or the quality of title is otherwise acceptable to the Secretary;

(B) all draft conveyances and closing documents have been received and approved;

(C) a current title commitment verifying compliance with applicable title standards has been issued to the Secretary;

(D) the appraisals comply with applicable Forest Service standards; and

(E) except as provided in section (8)(b), the title includes both the surface and subsurface estates without reservation or exception (except by the United States or the State of Montana, by patent), including

(i) minerals or mineral rights;

(ii) timber or timber rights; and

(iii) any other interest in the property.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF TITLE.—In the event the appraisal and/or quality of title do not meet Federal standards or are otherwise determined unacceptable to the Secretary, the Secretary shall advise the Company regarding corrective actions necessary to make an affirmative determination under paragraph (1). The Secretary, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, shall effect the conveyance of lands described in subsection (b)(2) not later than sixty days after the Secretary has made an affirmative determination under paragraph (1).

(f) COMPLIANCE WITH OPTION.—Notwithstanding section (3)(e)(2), the Secretary shall not consummate the conveyance of lands described in subsection (b)(2) until the Secretary has determined that title to the lands described in sections 4 and 5 have been escrowed as required by the document entitled "Option Agreement for the Exchange and/or Purchase of Real

Property Pursuant to the Gallatin Range Consolidation and Protection Act of 1993" (referred to in this Act as "the Option"), executed by the Company, as seller.

(g) REFERENCES.—References in this Act to the Company shall include references to the successors and assigns of the Company.

SEC. 4. LAND CONSOLIDATION—PORCUPINE AREA.

(a) ACQUISITION OF PORCUPINE PROPERTY.—The Secretary is authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase or exchange, lands and interests in lands listed as "Exhibit A, Porcupine Area", in the Option, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Option for the fair market value of such lands and interests, determined at the time of acquisition, in accordance with the appraisal standards specified in the Option.

(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall report annually to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, on the status of the acquisition authorized by this section.

SEC. 5. LAND CONSOLIDATION—TAYLOR FORK AREA.

(a) ACQUISITION OF TAYLOR FORK PROPERTY.—The Secretary is authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase or exchange, lands and interests in lands as listed as "Exhibit A, Taylor Fork Area", in the Option, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Option for the fair market value of such lands and interests, determined at the time of acquisition, in accordance with the appraisal standards specified in the Option.

(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall report annually to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, on the status of the pending acquisition authorized by this section.

SEC. 6. LAND CONSOLIDATION—GALLATIN ROADED AREA.

(a) ACQUISITION OF GALLATIN ROADED PROPERTY.—The Secretary is authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase or exchange, lands and interests in lands as listed as "Exhibit A, Gallatin Road", in the Option, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Option not otherwise acquired, purchased, or exchanged under section 3, 4, or 5.

(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall report annually to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, on the status of the acquisition authorized by this section.

SEC. 7. SEVERED MINERAL EXCHANGE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) underlying certain areas in Montana described in subsection (b) are mineral rights owned by subsidiaries of Burlington Resources, Incorporated and its successors and assigns (referred to in this Act as "Burlington");

(2) there are federally owned minerals underlying lands of Burlington lying outside those areas;

(3) Burlington has agreed in principle with the Secretary to an exchange of mineral rights to consolidate surface and subsurface ownerships and to avoid potential conflicts with the surface management of the areas; and

(4) it is desirable that an exchange of lands be completed not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) MINERAL INTERESTS.—

(1) ACQUISITION.—Pursuant to an exchange agreement between the Secretary and Burlington, the Secretary may acquire mineral interests owned by Burlington or an affiliate of Burlington underlying surface lands owned by the United States located in the areas depicted

on the maps entitled "Severed Minerals Exchange, Clearwater-Monture Area", dated September 1988, and "Severed Mineral Exchanges, Gallatin Area", dated September 1988, or in fractional sections adjacent to the areas depicted on the maps.

(2) EXCHANGE.—In exchange for the mineral interests conveyed to the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Interior shall convey, subject to valid existing rights, such federally owned mineral interests as the Secretary and Burlington may agree upon.

(c) EQUAL VALUE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The value of the mineral interests exchanged under subsection (b) shall be approximately equal in value based upon available information.

(2) APPRAISAL.—To ensure that the wilderness or other natural values of the area are not affected by the exchange, a formal appraisal based upon drilling or other surface disturbing activities shall not be required for any mineral interest proposed for exchange, except that the Secretary and Burlington shall fully share all available information on the quality and quantity of mineral interests proposed for exchange.

(3) INADEQUATE INFORMATION.—In the absence of adequate information regarding values of minerals proposed for exchange, the Secretary and Burlington may agree to an exchange on the basis of mineral interests of similar development potential, geologic character, and similar factors.

(d) IDENTIFICATION OF FEDERALLY OWNED MINERAL INTERESTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), mineral interests conveyed by the United States pursuant to this section shall underlie lands the surface of which are owned by Burlington.

(2) OTHER INTERESTS.—If there are not sufficient federally owned mineral interests of approximately equal value underlying lands owned by Burlington, the Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior may identify for exchange other federally owned mineral interests in lands in the State of Montana of which the surface estate is in private ownership.

(e) CONSULTATION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of the Interior in the negotiation of the exchange agreement authorized by subsection (b), particularly with respect to the inclusion in the agreement of a provision authorizing the exchange of federally owned mineral interests lying outside the boundaries of units of the National Forest System.

(2) CONVEYANCE.—Notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary of the Interior shall convey the federally owned mineral interests identified in a final exchange agreement between the Secretary of Agriculture and Burlington and affiliates of Burlington.

(f) MINERAL INTEREST DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term "mineral interests" includes all locatable and leaseable minerals, including oil and gas, geothermal resources, and other subsurface rights.

SEC. 8. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) MAPS.—The maps referred to in sections 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 are subject to such minor corrections as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the Company. The Secretary shall notify the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the United States House of Representatives of any corrections made pursuant to the subsection. The maps shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of Chief, Forest Service, USDA.

(b) TITLE OF LANDS CONVEYED TO THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) QUALITY OF TITLE AND RIGHTS.—Subject to paragraph (2), the rights, title, and interests to

lands conveyed to the United States under sections 4, 5 and 6 shall, at a minimum, consist of the surface estate and the subsurface rights owned by the Company or Burlington where applicable.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may accept title subject to outstanding or reserved oil and gas and geothermal rights, except that there shall be no surface occupancy permitted on the lands acquired by the United States under sections 4, 5, and 6 for access to reserved or outstanding rights or exploration or development of such lands.

(3) ACCESS.—No portion of lands acquired by the United States under this Act shall be available for access to, or exploration or development of, any reserved or outstanding oil, gas, geothermal, or other non-Federal property interest.

(c) NATIONAL FOREST LANDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—All lands conveyed to the United States under this Act shall be added to and administered as part of the Gallatin National Forest of the National Forest System by the Secretary in accordance with the laws and regulations pertaining to the National Forest System.

(2) HYALITE-PORCUPINE-BUFFALO HORN WILDERNESS STUDY AREA.—Lands acquired within the Hyalite-Porcupine-Buffalo Horn Wilderness Study Area shall be managed to maintain their presently existing wilderness character and potential for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System in accordance with the Montana Wilderness Study Act of 1977 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note).

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate amendment to H.R. 873, the legislation presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 874, the Gallatin Range Consolidation Act, was introduced by my friend and colleague on the Natural Resources Committee, Mr. WILLIAMS. The House passed this bill last spring and the Senate has sent it back to us with amendments. I recommend that the House concur with the Senate amendments.

The purpose of this bill is to block up checkerboard land ownership in the Gallatin Range of the Gallatin National Forest in Montana established as a result of railroad right of way grants over 100 years ago. Through a series of exchanges between the Big Sky Lumber Co. and the Forest Service, approximately 80,000 acres would be added to the national forest. These lands are of great ecological importance and there is widespread support

for the measure. Big Sky Lumber Co., the administration, and the environmental community all testified in favor of the bill at our hearing on March 23, 1993.

Furthermore, this bill promotes more efficient government and ultimately could and should save the taxpayer money. It blocks up a checkerboard ownership pattern that has been hampering land managers since the turn of the century. It is in the economic interest of both the adjacent private landowner and the Federal Government to consolidate land ownership so that the land can be managed properly. The bill also authorizes a severed minerals exchange. Currently, the Federal Government owns the subsurface rights, but not the surface rights on some lands and the surface rights, but not the subsurface on other lands. This situation greatly complicates land management. The bill corrects this inefficiency by consolidating Federal ownership so that the Federal Government owns both the surface and subsurface. If we do not pass this legislation, the difficulties involved in managing the checkerboard landownership and the severed minerals will continue to be a drain on the Treasury.

The Senate amendments update the House-passed language to reflect the fact that the Forest Service and not the nature conservancy now hold the options to acquire these lands. They also eliminate the \$3.4 million cash equalization provision and provide guidelines on how lands in the North Bridger Range are to be managed.

These amendments are acceptable and reflect the changed ownership of the option and I urge my colleagues to support this measure and help bring resolution to an issue that the Congress and the Forest Service have been trying to resolve since the 1920's.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the intent of H.R. 873 which is to consolidate the onerous checkerboard land ownership pattern on the Gallatin National Forest.

I believe the Senate made several important improvements in H.R. 873 as passed by the House. The \$3.4 million cash equalization payment to Big Sky Lumber in section 3 has been eliminated. Moreover, the role of nonprofit land trusts in facilitating these exchanges has been deleted.

I do remain concerned that over time this legislation will result in a net increase in Federal ownership of 60,000 acres. Although H.R. 873 gives the Forest Service the option of acquiring these lands through exchange, I fear environmental groups will not allow any of this land to be removed from Federal ownership because of its proximity to Yellowstone National Park.

Despite these reservations, I am painfully aware of the difficult task

Mr. WILLIAMS had in trying to accommodate many diverse interests at once. As a result, I support this legislation H.R. 873.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] and I take this opportunity to thank him for his hard work on this measure.

□ 1310

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the committee chairman and I thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the other members of our committee for working for so many months with me on this legislation. This has been a dream of the public in this country and particularly in Montana since 1925, and the dream has been to consolidate these lands north of Yellowstone Park into private ownership.

These lands are the home of the Nation's largest elk herd. Along with Yellowstone Park, the mountains of these lands are the last stands of countless endangered species, including the grizzly. This mountain range is the birthplace of some of the Nation's most important rivers, including the only long critically wild river left in this country, and that is the Yellowstone.

The Senate did an admirable job in keeping this legislation on track, and with only minor changes it has returned my bill for agreement to send to the President. The only significant change in the bill is the removal of appropriate funding that the House had requested. That was approximately \$3.4 million. As my colleagues remember, that funding was the subject of some debate here in the House. I took seriously the reservations of some folks, and although it was the eleventh hour, I worked with the Senate and the landowners toward a no appropriation solution.

This change, I must say, did harm our ability to accomplish all that we had hoped for in consolidation of lands and making commitments to folks, particularly those along the North Bridger Mountains. These folks are still not satisfied entirely with this Federal policy in this matter.

In spite of those real concerns, this legislation does not ask for any of this Nation's funds to complete the consolidation. The trade, by the way, is supported by the Forest Service, most local landowners, the State of Montana, local and national conservation groups, the Senate, and, I hope today, the House of Representatives. I sincerely ask that we add our voice to this chorus and all vote for the passage of H.R. 873. This could be the single most important step this Nation can make this year in the protection of the Yellowstone National Park and the values that led to the creation of the park so long ago.

There is one more comment I would like to address directly to those folks along the North Bridger Range near Flathead Pass:

With regard to your concerns, this legislation was not the solution I had hoped for. I believed that we did have some options which would have identified lands to substitute for the critical watershed lands that concern you. The Senate did provide strong direction to the Forest Service to continue to work on a possible trade of lands, and they did provide some greater protection for any possible timber harvest.

I worked with both of our Senators to develop that language. I know, however, that folks in the North Bridgers want more than that, and I want them to know that we do not consider this a closed issue. I am committed to continue to see that their backyard near Flathead Pass, a beautiful area, one that is important environmentally as well as economically, does not become the sacrifice area that many of the people fear.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to thank the chairman for working with us for the realization of this issue which, as I say, has been a dream for folks in Montana since the 1920's.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] on his statement, and I ask for the support of the Members for this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 873.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION AUTHORIZATION

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2139) to amend title 44, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2139

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2504(f) of title 44, United States Code is amended by striking "(f)(1)" and all that follows through the end of paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

"(f)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Historical Publications and Records Commission such amounts as may be necessary to carry out this chapter for each of fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT].

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2139 authorizes appropriations for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission for fiscal years 1994 through 1998.

The Commission is an agency that gives grants for the preservation, publication, and editing of historical materials. Since its founding in 1934, the Commission has supported hundreds of documentary publication projects covering the history of the United States from colonial times to the present. Recent projects have resulted in new volumes of the Black Abolitionist Papers, Papers of the Founding Fathers, George C. Marshall, Susan B. Anthony, and many others.

The Commission's program for the preservation of historical records is generally aimed at the collection and preservation of important records of State and local governments, non-governmental institutions, societies, and individuals.

Although the Commission only receives a few million Federal dollars, it gets a lot of mileage out of the money. It uses Federal funds in partnership with private funds to increase overall support for historical programs. The Commission is able to generate private support equal to the Federal appropriation.

The Commission is small. Over the last 5 years, its appropriations have ranged between \$4 million and \$5.5 million. In the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill recently passed by the House, the Commission was given \$4 million for 1994. The Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended \$6 million. H.R. 2139 authorizes such sums as may be necessary for the next 5 years.

The Commission is administratively part of the National Archives and Records Administration. The reauthorization is strongly supported by the National Archives and by many historical and other organizations. I do not know of anyone who opposes reauthorizing the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the ranking member of this subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Information, Justice, Transportation and Agriculture of the Committee on Government Operations, our colleague, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS], is unable to be on the House floor at this moment because of another matter to which he is obligated. As the ranking member of an-

other subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations, I am pleased to stand in the stead of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS], today and to endorse the passage of H.R. 2139, which authorizes the National Historical Publications and Records Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply join in the remarks made by the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT] and thank him for his leadership and his work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on behalf of the reauthorization of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission [NHPRC]. As you know, this Commission includes by law a Member from the House and one from the Senate as well as a member of the Supreme Court. It is in the capacity as the Speaker's appointee to the Commission that I rise today.

The National Historical Publications and Records Commission is a small agency within the National Archives. But its small size is no indication of the large work it does in preserving and making available the historical memory of this Nation through a series of grants in support of documentary publications and preservation programs in all 50 States.

The work of the NHPRC goes a long way toward guaranteeing that the fundamental documents of our Nation's history, at the Federal, State, and local levels are preserved for future generations, as well as for use today by scholars, government officials, school teachers, and the general public. The NHPRC supports such projects as the papers of the Founders of this country, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and others. The list also includes James Adams, Martin Luther King, Jr., Thomas Edison, and Booker T. Washington. In the area of documentary preservation, grants from the NHPRC support projects and programs to save from ravages of time a wide range of valuable records that are vital to understanding the history and development of each State and region in the Nation.

The NHPRC goes about its mission with efficiency and relatively little fanfare. Naturally it has the support of a broad spectrum of associations representing professional historians, librarians, and archivists, such as the American Historical Association and the Society of American Archivists, those most directly concerned with the preservation and use of historical records. But the support for the work of this agency comes from many other groups as well, such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the National Association of Counties, the American Family Records Association, the American Library Association, the Association of American University Presses, and the Federation of Genealogical Societies to name just a few of the organizations who support reauthorization of the NHPRC.

Mr. Speaker, many of these organizations stress the urgency of the mission of the NHPRC in light of existing challenges and new

ones on the horizon. Funds in support of documentary preservation, and the publication of important historical records at all levels of government have not kept pace with the demand to maintain valuable information that is slipping away from us for want of proper preservation. Furthermore, many of the records of the present and the future will be created, used, and preserved in electronic format. We have no national standards for the preservation of electronic data, and no easy solutions to the many problems attendant to the long-range preservation and use of electronic records. The NHPRC has spearheaded the search for solutions in these important areas. Reauthorization of the NHPRC is an important step toward ensuring that the Nation's memory is properly kept and made available for all Americans to use.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2139, which reauthorizes the National Historical Publications and Records Commission [NHPRC]. This Commission plays a vital role in our effort to preserve our heritage and allow future generations to have access to this important data. The NHPRC provides scholars, legislators, journalists, and others with precise, accessible records regarding our Nation's history.

The NHPRC was established by Congress in 1934 and is part of the National Archives and Records Administration. It is designed to give grants for promoting the publication and preservation of historical documents. This has resulted in hundreds of documentary projects that record the history of national, State, and local governments.

I want to thank Chairman CONDIT for moving this bill expeditiously to the floor. As ranking member of the Information, Justice, Transportation, and Agriculture Subcommittee on Government Operations, I am pleased to see the NHPRC reauthorized for the next 5 years.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2139.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2139, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 12, rule

I, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired at 3 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m., the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. COLEMAN].

ELECTION OF THE HONORABLE G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE UNTIL SEPTEMBER 15, 1993

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 249

Resolved, That the Honorable G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery, a Representative from the State of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, elected Speaker pro tempore during any absence of the Speaker, such authority to continue not later than September 15, 1993.

Resolved, That the President and the Senate be notified by the Clerk of the election of the Honorable G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE DURING ABSENCE OF THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. COLEMAN). The Chair will now administer the oath of office to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. MONTGOMERY appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office administered to him by the Speaker pro tempore, as follows: Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter. So help you God.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 248, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call

up House Resolution 248 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 248

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2401) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes. No further amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 2 of this resolution. Pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate may be offered only by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. Except as specified in section 2 or 3 of this resolution, each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for ten minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against amendments printed in the report are waived.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time for the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or germane modifications thereof. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read except that modification shall be reported. Amendments en bloc shall be debatable for twenty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. For the purpose of inclusion in amendments en bloc, and amendment printed in the form of a motion to strike may be modified to the form of a germane perfecting amendment to the text originally proposed to be stricken. All points of order against amendments en bloc are waived. The original proponent of an amendment included in amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the Congressional Record immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

SEC. 3. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment made in order by this resolution. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than five minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business: *Provided*, That the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than fifteen minutes. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may recognize for consideration of an amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules out of the order printed, but

not sooner than one hour after the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services announces from the floor a request to that effect.

SEC. 4. After disposition of the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules, the Committee shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. All time yielded during the consideration of House Resolution 248 is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 248 is the third rule recommended by the Committee on Rules providing for the consideration of H.R. 2401, the Department of Defense authorization for fiscal year 1994. This rule provides for the orderly consideration of 54 amendments to the bill; it does not, however, dispose of all the amendments which have been proposed to H.R. 2401. The Committee on Rules anticipates that a fourth rule will be reported today and at the meeting the committee will dispose of the amendments still pending before the committee.

House Resolution 248 provides that only those amendments printed in the report accompanying the rule will be eligible for consideration. The rule also provides that en bloc amendments described in section 2 of the rule are also eligible for consideration. In addition, the rule prohibits the offering of pro forma amendments by any Member but the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Except as specified in sections 2 and 3 of House Resolution 248, the amendments made in order are to be considered only in the order they are printed in the accompanying report and are to be offered only by the Member designated in the report. Each of these amendments are to be considered as having been read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and, finally, shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule also waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report.

Section 2 of House Resolution 248 grants the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services the authority to offer, at any point, amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report, or germane modifications of those amendments. The Committee on Rules has recommended this procedure in order to expedite the consideration of amendments which have been

generally accepted by the Committee on Armed Services. These en bloc amendments shall be considered as read, except that if the chairman offers a germane modification of the amendment originally proposed, that modification shall be read.

The en bloc amendments shall be debatable for 20 minutes which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. And, because the debate time is so limited on the en bloc amendments, the rule permits the original proponent of the amendment to insert a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately before the disposition of the amendment.

Section 3 permits the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to reduce to 5 minutes any postponed votes taken immediately after a 15-minute vote. The Chair is also authorized to take amendments out of the order they are found in the report accompanying this rule, but only if the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services gives at least 1 hour's notice of such a request.

Finally, the rule provides that after the disposition of the amendments printed in the report, the committee shall rise and no further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the orderly consideration of a large number of amendments and was developed in close consultation with the minority.

I urge support of the rule in order that the House may proceed to the consideration of these amendments to the fiscal year 1994 Defense authorization.

□ 1510

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding us half the time.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from South Carolina has just indicated, we have before us now the third rule providing for the consideration of amendments to the National Defense Authorization Act.

At 4:30 this afternoon, the Committee on Rules will be meeting again to grant one more rule for this bill. This is unprecedented in the 15 years, at least, that I have been here. Hopefully, it will be the last one.

And so Members can anticipate finishing up on this important defense bill tomorrow, depending on how late we work Tuesday, because I believe that the House will not be in session on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, because of the Jewish religious observances.

Turning now to the rule presently before us, I must say at the outset that this rule represents an improvement over the two rules that preceded it, since the previous rule was jerry-rigged to produce certain results before the votes were even taken.

This present rule is at least the product of bipartisan discussion, even though it is not an open rule allowing all Members to participate in writing this important piece of legislation.

However, the present rule does contain a fair and proper balance of amendments to be made in order, and I would thank the Democrat majority for that.

And Mr. Speaker, this rule is, I hope, indicative of a return to the traditional method of considering defense authorization bills on a bipartisan basis.

That is the most important issue that ever comes before this body each year. It has always been bipartisan in nature and I hope we are going to go back to that.

Having said all of that, however, I am constrained to oppose this rule.

I oppose this rule because Members are still being denied an opportunity to debate two of the most important and controversial issues of the day.

I am referring to the question of whether or not homosexuals should be permitted to serve in the military and to the presence of United States troops in Somalia for what now appears to be a mission that goes far beyond the humanitarian purposes for which they were originally sent.

Over in the other body, these two controversial issues were not blocked from floor consideration, and Members realize by now that the Senate debated both of these issues at great length and reached positions on both that have broad, bipartisan support. That is exactly the way it should be. That is what these two bodies are here for. But for the House to do anything less, Mr. Speaker, would be a dereliction of our duty, and we certainly would not be representing our constituents back home.

Mr. Speaker, you know we Republicans requested a debate on the Somalia issue prior to the August district work period. That was 6 weeks ago; but here we are again, some 6 weeks later, and the House is still being denied this debate.

Mr. Speaker, since United States troops were first deployed in Somalia 10 months ago, 11 of our soldiers have been killed and more than 50 have been wounded. At least 4 have been wounded just since Friday, as violence in the streets of Mogadishu has escalated to new heights, in a locale where there is not even a government in place.

There is no judiciary system. There is no anything there.

Mr. Speaker, what began 10 months ago as a strictly humanitarian operation of very limited scope and dura-

tion has gradually been transformed into a wide-ranging commitment of virtually unlimited scope and indefinite duration. That is not right.

Moreover, the Clinton administration has abdicated control—and this is what really gets me, they have abdicated control over this operation to such an extent that the Secretary-General of the United Nations is now calling the shots concerning what American troops are supposed to be doing and for how long they will continue doing it. The United Nations is telling us, Mr. Speaker, what to do.

Mr. Speaker, the House should not let another day pass without having a full, frank, and fair debate on this issue.

The Democrat leadership should not deny rank-and-file Members from either side of the aisle, Democrats or Republicans, from debating this issue that is so terribly important to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, when the vote is taken on this rule, I will ask all Members to vote down the previous question, vote against the previous question.

If the previous question is defeated, we will immediately bring back a rule that allows three amendments covering all sides of the "gays in the military" issue, so all sides can be heard in a fair and open debate, and we would also make in order an amendment by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] on Somalia.

A similar amendment to Mr. GILMAN's was the catalyst for debate in the Senate, and we must conduct the same kind of debate here in the House.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have other speakers?

Mr. SOLOMON. We do have other speakers. They are not here on the floor. If the gentleman has no further requests, I would be glad to sum up for the minority and go on with the vote.

Mr. DERRICK. That is fine.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to dwell again on the issue of Somalia. We have a situation in which we now have troops in a place called Macedonia, which is not really a country, but those troops are under a foreign command. Those troops have been told by their commander, who is a foreign commander—the first time that American troops have ever served under a foreign command—that even if they are fired upon they are not allowed to defend themselves.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in the history of our armed services that this have ever happened.

We now have a similar situation taking place in Somalia. When we put our troops over there, it was to save some starving people. Now the situation has deteriorated such that there is not even a government in Somalia. There is nothing there for us to be defending,

and yet our troops are still there with no mission. Such policy, as there may be, is being set by the United Nations, not the United States.

Mr. Speaker, that is wrong. We ought to be debating this issue on the floor. We were not allowed to debate it here on the floor 6 weeks ago. Since that time, American soldiers have died. American soldiers have been wounded, and the situation continues to worsen day by day.

□ 1520

Mr. Speaker, we should bring those troops home, and we should have that debate on this floor today, not tomorrow, or not next week or the weeks after, but we ought to be here today doing it. That is why I ask the Members to vote down the previous question, so that we would have that opportunity on the floor of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, let me say something before I move the previous question. I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]. As the gentleman knows, I went to Somalia about a month or two before we sent troops there, and I came back, and my observation was that our problem was not being able to feed these people, but our problem was going to be when we got them fed, what were we going to do, and that is as it has turned out.

My colleagues, I, like the rest of our countrymen, am embarrassed that this ragtag warlord over there is running all over the place and we cannot seem to do anything with him. We are not equipped and have no business fighting a war over there. We went over there as a humanitarian exercise, and I agree with that.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1522

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1603

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, at 4 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m. the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2401, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question de novo on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 248, on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 5(b)(1) of rule XV, the Chair may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for any recorded vote that may be ordered on adoption of the resolution without intervening business.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 169, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 424]

YEAS—237

Abercrombie	Brown (OH)	Deutsch
Ackerman	Bryant	Dicks
Andrews (ME)	Byrne	Dingell
Andrews (NJ)	Cantwell	Dixon
Applegate	Cardin	Dooley
Bacchus (FL)	Carr	Durbin
Baessler	Clay	Edwards (CA)
Barca	Clayton	Edwards (TX)
Barcia	Clement	Engel
Barlow	Clyburn	English (AZ)
Barrett (WI)	Coleman	English (OK)
Becerra	Collins (IL)	Eshoo
Bellenson	Collins (MI)	Evans
Berman	Condit	Fazio
Beverly	Coppersmith	Fields (LA)
Bilbray	Costello	Filner
Bishop	Coyne	Fingerhut
Blackwell	Cramer	Flake
Bonior	Danner	Foglietta
Borski	Darden	Ford (MI)
Boucher	de la Garza	Ford (TN)
Brewster	Deal	Frank (MA)
Browder	DeLauro	Furse
Brown (CA)	Dellums	Gedjenson
Brown (FL)	Derrick	Gephardt

Geren	McCloskey	Sawyer
Gibbons	McCurdy	Schenk
Glickman	McDermott	Schroeder
Gonzalez	McHale	Schumer
Gordon	McKinney	Scott
Green	McNulty	Serrano
Gutierrez	Meehan	Shepherd
Hall (OH)	Meek	Sisisky
Hall (TX)	Menendez	Skaggs
Hamburg	Mfume	Skelton
Hamilton	Mineta	Slattery
Harman	Minge	Slaughter
Hastings	Mink	Smith (IA)
Hayes	Moakley	Spratt
Hefner	Mollohan	Stark
Hilliard	Montgomery	Stenholm
Hinchey	Moran	Stokes
Hoagland	Murphy	Strickland
Hochbrueckner	Murtha	Studds
Holden	Nadler	Stupak
Hoyer	Natcher	Sweet
Hutto	Neal (MA)	Swift
Inslee	Neal (NC)	Synar
Jefferson	Oberstar	Tanner
Johnson (GA)	Obey	Tauzin
Johnson, E.B.	Oliver	Taylor (MS)
Johnston	Ortiz	Tejeda
Kanjorski	Orton	Thompson
Kaptur	Pallone	Thornton
Kennedy	Parker	Thurman
Kennelly	Pastor	Torres
Kildee	Payne (NJ)	Torricelli
Klein	Payne (VA)	Towns
Klink	Pelosi	Trafficant
Kopetski	Penny	Tucker
Kreidler	Peterson (FL)	Unsoeld
LaFalce	Peterson (MN)	Valentine
Lambert	Pickett	Velazquez
Lancaster	Pomeroy	Vento
Lantos	Poshard	Visclosky
LaRocco	Price (NC)	Volkmer
Laughlin	Rahall	Waters
Levin	Rangel	Watt
Lewis (GA)	Reed	Waxman
Lloyd	Reynolds	Wheat
Long	Richardson	Whitten
Lowe	Roemer	Williams
Maloney	Rostenkowski	Wilson
Mann	Rowland	Wise
Manton	Roybal-Allard	Woolsey
Margolies	Rush	Wyden
Mezvinsky	Sabo	Wynn
Markey	Sanders	Yates
Matsui	Sangmeister	
Mazzoli	Sarpalius	

NAYS—169

Allard	Dornan	Hutchinson
Archer	Dreier	Hyde
Armey	Duncan	Inglis
Bachus (AL)	Dunn	Inhofe
Baker (CA)	Emerson	Istook
Baker (LA)	Everett	Jacobs
Ballenger	Ewing	Johnson (CT)
Barrett (NE)	Fawell	Johnson, Sam
Bartlett	Fields (TX)	Kasich
Bateman	Fish	Kim
Bentley	Fowler	King
Bereuter	Franks (CT)	Klug
Billirakis	Franks (NJ)	Knollenberg
Bliley	Gallely	Kolbe
Blute	Gallo	Kyl
Boehlert	Gekas	Lazio
Boehner	Gilchrest	Leach
Bonilla	Gillmor	Levy
Bunning	Gilman	Lewis (CA)
Burton	Gingrich	Lewis (FL)
Buyer	Goodlatte	Lightfoot
Callahan	Goodling	Linder
Calvert	Goss	Livingston
Camp	Grams	Machtley
Canady	Grandy	Manzullo
Castle	Greenwood	McCandless
Clinger	Gunderson	McCollum
Coble	Hancock	McCrery
Collins (GA)	Hansen	McDade
Combest	Hastert	McHugh
Cooper	Hefley	McInnis
Crane	Herger	McKeon
Crapo	Hobson	McMillan
Cunningham	Hoekstra	Meyers
DeLay	Horn	Mica
Diaz-Balart	Houghton	Michel
Dickey	Huffington	Miller (FL)
Doolittle	Hunter	Molinar

Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers

Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon

Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—27

Andrews (TX)
Barton
Brooks
Chapman
Conyers
Cox
DeFazio
Farr
Frost

Hoke
Hughes
Johnson (SD)
Kingston
Klecza
Lehman
Lipinski
Martinez
Miller (CA)

Owens
Pickle
Porter
Rose
Sharp
Shuster
Washington
Young (AK)
Zimmer

□ 1627

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Klecza for, with Mr. Kingston against.

Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Porter against.

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 169, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 425]

AYES—234

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Applegate
Baesler
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Clay

Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans

Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hoiden
Hoyer

Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Marcolles-Mezvinsky
Marker
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Mineta
Minge

Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shepherd

NOES—169

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooper
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson

Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gillman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingalls
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe

Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Skeen

Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (NC)

Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—30

Andrews (TX)
Bacchus (FL)
Brooks
Chapman
Conyers
DeFazio
Farr
Ford (TN)
Frost
Greenwood

Gutierrez
Hoke
Johnson (SD)
Kingston
Klecza
Lehman
Lipinski
Martinez
Miller (CA)
Neal (MA)

Owens
Pickle
Porter
Rose
Sharp
Shuster
Washington
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

□ 1639

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Klecza for, with Mr. Kingston against.

Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Porter against.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUDGET AMENDMENT REQUESTS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR 1994 AND 1993—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 103-136)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act, I am transmitting the District of Columbia Government's fiscal year 1994 budget amendment request and fiscal year 1993 supplemental budget amendment request.

The District of Columbia Government has submitted a request to decrease its fiscal year 1994 general fund spending authority by \$36.968 million with a reduction of 832 FTE positions. In addition, the District's fiscal year 1993 supplemental amendment request includes an increase of \$7.367 million in general fund spending authority. The amendments are needed to address a projected operating deficit for fiscal year 1993 and fiscal year 1994 that was not addressed in the District's original budget submission pending congressional action.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 13, 1993.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 19, 1993.

Hon. TOM FOLEY,

The Speaker of the House, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER FOLEY: Please be advised that I hereby resign from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service effective September 13, 1993.

Sincerely,

JIM SAXTON,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Government Operations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 13, 1993.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY, Speaker,

House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please be advised that I hereby resign my seat on the Committee on Government Operations effective immediately.

Sincerely,

RONALD K. MACHTLEY,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

MODIFICATION TO SISISKY AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2401, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of the bill H.R. 2401, pursuant to House Resolution 248, the amendment numbered 1 in House Report 103-236 by Mr. SISISKY be modified in the form that I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from California please explain the purpose of the modification.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would be happy to explain the modification. Mr. SISISKY's defense response fund amendment, printed in House Report 103-236, strikes section 1005 from the defense authorization bill. That section has already been stricken by a previous amendment and the modification that I placed at the desk is a technical cor-

rection that saves section 1005 from being stricken twice.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment, as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to the Amendment offered by Mr. SISISKY of Virginia: The amendment as modified is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title X (page 329, after line 25), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1008. DEFENSE RESPONSE FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 3 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 127 the following new section:

"§ 127a. Expenses for response operations; Defense Response Fund

"(a) AUTHORITY TO USE RESPONSE FUND.—In any case in which the armed forces are used to carry out an operation described in subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense may provide funds for the cost of such operation, subject to the limitations in this section, from the Defense Response Fund. Such funds shall be available only for the incremental costs to the Department of Defense of carrying out such operation.

"(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—(1) There is established in the Treasury a fund to be known as the 'Defense Response Fund'. Amounts in the fund shall be available, subject to the limitations in this section, for transfer to the operation and maintenance and military personnel accounts of the Department of Defense.

"(2) Amounts appropriated to the fund shall remain available until expended.

"(3) Transfers from the fund shall not be charged against the maximum amount of transfer that may be made under any provision in an annual defense authorization or appropriations Act providing general authority for the transfer of funds among accounts and funds of the Department of Defense.

"(c) AUTHORIZED PURPOSES OF FUND.—Amounts in the fund may be used, at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, only in connection with an operation required of the Department of Defense by the President which is one of the following:

"(1) A foreign disaster relief operation.

"(2) A peacekeeping operation carried out under the auspices of the United Nations or another international organization.

"(3) A peace enforcement operation carried out under the auspices of the United Nations or another international organization.

"(4) An operation to provide support to domestic civil authority.

"(5) A noncombatant evacuation operation.

"(d) FINANCIAL PLAN FOR OPERATIONS EXPECTED TO EXHAUST FUND.—In the case of any operation for which funds are provided under this section which the Secretary of Defense determines may exhaust the balance in the fund, the Secretary shall promptly submit to Congress a financial plan for the operation that sets forth the manner by which it is proposed by the executive branch to obtain funds for the total incremental cost to the United States of the operation.

"(e) PROHIBITION AGAINST USE FOR ONGOING AND SMALL-SCALE OPERATIONS.—(1) Amounts in the fund are not available—

"(A) for ongoing operations (except as provided in paragraph (2)(B)); or

"(B) for small-scale operations.

"(2)(A) For purposes of this subsection, an ongoing operation is an operation that was

underway while the budget of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year during which the operation is to be funded was being prepared for submission to Congress.

"(B) The prohibition in paragraph (1)(A) does not apply in the case of an ongoing operation that was expected (as of the time such budget was being prepared) to be completed by the beginning of the fiscal year for which such budget was prepared but which (for reasons that could not be anticipated at the time of such preparation) continued into that fiscal year.

"(3) For purposes of this subsection, a small-scale operation is one for which the total incremental cost to the Department of Defense is expected to be less than \$1,000,000.

"(f) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—Obligations for the incremental costs for any operation described in subsection (c) may not be made in excess of \$20,000,000 until the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress notification of the intention to make such obligations in excess of such amount and a period of 20 days has elapsed.

"(g) INCREMENTAL COSTS.—For purposes of this section, incremental costs of the Department of Defense with respect to an operation are the costs that are directly attributable to the operation and that are otherwise chargeable to accounts available for operation and maintenance or for military personnel. Any costs which are otherwise chargeable to accounts available for procurement may not be considered to be incremental costs for purposes of this section.

"(h) GAO AUDITS.—In addition to the financial statements and audits required by section 3515 and 3521 of title 31, United States Code, the Comptroller General of the United States shall from time to time carry out examinations of the fund to ensure that proper accounting procedures are followed and to determine whether the requirements and limitations in this section are being complied with."

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 127 the following new item:

"127a. Expenses for response operations; Defense Response Fund."

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994.—There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1994 to the Defense Response Fund established under section 127a of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), the sum of \$30,000,000.

(c) TRANSITION PROVISION.—In the case of any operation described in subsection (c) of section 127a of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), that is ongoing as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the limitation in subsection (e)(1)(A) of such section shall not apply with respect to expenditures during fiscal year 1994.

Mr. DELLUMS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, as modified, be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California that the amendment be modified?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 248 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2401.

□ 1643

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2401) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes, with Mr. DURBIN (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 248, no further amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is in order except the amendments printed in House Report 103-236 and amendments en bloc described in section 2 of House Resolution 248. Pro forma amendments for purpose of debate may be offered only by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Except as specified in section 2 or 3 of House Resolution 248, each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment, shall not be subject to amendment and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, or his designee, to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report or germane modifications thereof. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, except that the modifications shall be reported.

Amendments en bloc shall be debatable for 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, shall not be subject to amendment and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

For the purpose of inclusion in amendments en bloc, an amendment printed in the form of a motion to strike may be modified to the form of a germane perfecting amendment to the text originally proposed to be stricken.

The original proponent of an amendment included in amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately be-

fore disposition of the amendments en bloc.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment made in order by House Resolution 248.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may recognize for the consideration of an amendment printed in the report out of the order printed, but not sooner than 1 hour after the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services announces from the floor a request to that effect.

After disposition of the amendments printed in the report, the committee shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

The Chair will announce the number of the amendment made in order by the rule and the name of its sponsor in order to give notice to the Committee of the Whole as to the order of recognition.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 248, I offer the following en bloc amendments printed in House Report 103-236:

Amendment No. 3, as modified;
Amendment No. 4, as modified;
Amendment No. 12, as modified;
Amendments Nos. 13, 14;
Amendment No. 15, as modified;
Amendments Nos. 16, 17, 18;
Amendment No. 19, as modified;
Amendment No. 20;
Amendment No. 21, as modified;
Amendments Nos. 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40;
Amendments Nos. 41 and 42, as modified;
Amendments Nos. 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49;
Amendment No. 50, as modified; and
Amendments Nos. 51, 52, 53, and 54.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendments and report the modified amendments.

The Clerk proceeded to read amendment No. 3, as modified, offered by Mr. TRAFICANT.

Mr. DELLUMS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the en bloc amendments, as modified, be considered as read, and that the en bloc amendments, as designated and as modified, be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The texts of the en bloc amendments offered by Mr. DELLUMS are as follows:

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT OF OHIO

The amendment as modified is as follows:
At the end of title VIII (page 293, before line 17), add the following new sections:

SEC. 825. COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.

No funds authorized pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c, popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

SEC. 826. SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 827. PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS.

If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a fraudulent label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States, that was not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT OF OHIO

The amendment as modified is as follows:
At the end of title VIII (page 293, before line 17), add the following new section:

SEC. 825. RECIPROCITY.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), no contract or subcontract may be made with funds authorized under this Act to a company organized under the laws of a foreign country unless the Administrator finds that such country affords comparable opportunities to companies organized under the laws of the United States.

(b) EXCEPTION.—(1) The Administrator may waive the rule stated under subsection (a) if the products or services required are not reasonably available from companies organized under the laws of the United States. Any such waiver shall be reported to the Congress.

(2) Subsection (a) shall not apply to the extent that to do so would violate the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or any other international agreement to which the United States is a party.

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DANNER OF MISSOURI

The amendment as modified is as follows:
At the end of title XXXI (page 589, after line 17), insert the following new section:

SEC. 3139. PROHIBITION ON CONDUCT OF SAFE-GUARD C PROGRAM.

None of the funds appropriated pursuant to this Act or any other Act for any fiscal year

may be available to conduct the Safeguard C program or any other program to maintain the capability of the United States to conduct atmospheric testing of a nuclear weapon.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BILBRAY OF NEVADA

At the end of title VIII (page , after line), insert the following new section:

SEC. 825. CLARIFICATION OF EXCLUSION OF MILITARY ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING CONTRACTS UNDER SMALL BUSINESS COMPETITIVENESS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

(a) CLARIFICATION OF EXCLUSION.—Section 717(d) of the Small Business Competitiveness Demonstration Program Act of 1988 (title VII of Public Law 100-656) is amended by striking out "and such contract was" and inserting in lieu thereof "but only if such contracts were".

(b) CLARIFICATION OF APPLICABILITY OF FREEZE ON NUMERICAL SIZE STANDARD.—Section 732 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 632 note) is amended by adding at the end the following: "As provided in section 717(d), the preceding sentence does not apply to architectural and engineering services assigned to standard industrial classification code 8711 and performed under contracts awarded under the qualification-based selection procedures required by title IX of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 541 et seq.)."

(c) REQUIREMENT TO LIFT FREEZE ON NUMERICAL SIZE STANDARD AND MILITARY ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES CONTRACTS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall remove any numerical size standard pertaining to contract awards assigned to standard industrial classification code 8711 that are made by the Department of Defense, in conformance with section 732 of the Small Business Competitiveness Demonstration Program Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 632 note), as amended by subsection (b).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ROS-LEHTINEN

At the end of title I of the bill, insert the following section:

SEC. . CONVEYANCE OF OBSERVATION AIRCRAFT.

(a) AUTHORITY TO CONVEY.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may convey without consideration all right, title, and interest of the United States in not more than four light observation aircraft to the organization known as Hermanos al Rescate, a nonprofit organization in the State of Florida consisting of volunteer pilots who fly search and rescue missions from southern Florida over the Florida Straits (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "recipient").

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), light observation aircraft are the OV-2, the OV-10, or any comparable observation aircraft.

(b) CONDITION.—As a condition of conveying an aircraft to the recipient pursuant to the authority provided in subsection (a), the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the recipient under which the recipient agrees—

(1) to use that aircraft solely for search and rescue missions and related activities;

(2) to use that aircraft solely for nonprofit activities; and

(3) to hold the United States harmless for any claim arising with respect to that aircraft after the conveyance of that aircraft.

(c) LIMITATION ON FUTURE TRANSFERS.—In the case of an aircraft conveyed under the authority provided in subsection (a), the instruments provided for the conveyance shall

require that any further conveyance of an interest in that aircraft may not be made without the approval in advance of the Secretary of Defense. If the Secretary determines that an interest in an aircraft was conveyed without such approval, then all right, title, and interest in that aircraft shall revert to the United States and the United States shall have the right to immediate possession of the aircraft. The recipient shall pay the United States for its costs incurred in recovering the aircraft for such a violation.

(d) FORFEITURE UPON VIOLATION OF TERMS.—If the Secretary determines that the recipient violated subsection (b)(1) or (b)(2) with respect to any aircraft conveyed under subsection (a), then all right, title, and interest in each such aircraft shall revert to the United States and the United States shall have the right to immediate possession of all of the aircraft. The recipient shall pay the United States for its costs incurred in recovering the aircraft for a violation of those conditions.

(e) DELIVERY OF AIRCRAFT.—The Secretary shall deliver each aircraft conveyed under subsection (a)—

(1) at the place where the aircraft is located on the date of the conveyance;

(2) in its condition on that date; and

(3) without cost to the United States.

(f) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY TO CONVEY.—The authority of the Secretary under subsection (a) to convey aircraft shall expire on the date that is two years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. INSLEE OF WASHINGTON

The amendment as modified is as follows:

At the end of title X (page 346, after line 23), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1043. REDESIGNATION OF HANFORD ARID LANDS ECOLOGY RESERVE.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—The Hanford Arid Lands Ecology Reserve in Richland, Washington, is redesignated as the "Fitzner/Eberhardt Arid Lands Ecology Reserve".

(b) LEGAL REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, regulation, document, record, map, or other paper of the United States to the ecology reserve referred to in subsection (a) is deemed to be a reference to the "Fitzner/Eberhardt Arid Lands Ecology Reserve".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

At the end of subtitle B of title III (page , after line), insert the following new section:

SEC. 324. LIMITATION ON USE OF GOVERNMENT FACILITIES FOR CERTAIN MASTER SHIP REPAIR AGREEMENTS.

(a) LIMITATION.—The only non-Federal Government entity who may include the use of facilities owned, operated, or under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense in a bid or solicitation for ship repair activities with the Department of Defense is an entity referred to in subsection (b).

(b) COVERED ENTITIES.—An entity referred to in subsection (a) is a person who, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, holds a master ship repair agreement with the Department of Defense in the relevant homeport area.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

In section 1332 of the bill, after subsection (c) of such section (page 405, after line 16), insert the following new subsection (and redesignate the subsequent subsection accordingly):

(d) STUDY ON EXPANSION OF THE LAW ENFORCEMENT PLACEMENT PROGRAM TO INCLUDE THE BORDER PATROL.—(1) The Secretary of

Defense, in consultation with the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, shall conduct a study regarding the feasibility of expanding the law enforcement placement program established under section 1152 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), to include the placement of members of the Armed Forces who are discharged or released from active duty with the Border Patrol of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

(2) Not later than March 1, 1994, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress containing the results of the study required by this subsection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KASICH OF OHIO

At the end of division A, add the following new title:

TITLE XV—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ARMS CONTROL

SEC. 1501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "National Commission on Arms Control Act".

SEC. 1502. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the global proliferation of strategic and conventional military weapons and related equipment and the technology necessary to produce such weapons and equipment undermines regional security and international stability;

(2) regional arms races involving such military weapons and related equipment diverts vital resources from economic development and increases the risk of aggressive and pre-emptive war;

(3) national self-restraint in the export of such military weapons and related equipment requires multilateral cooperation; and

(4) as a world leader, the United States has a responsibility to help stop such global proliferation and guide all countries toward a safer world.

SEC. 1503. ESTABLISHMENT.

There is established a commission to be known as the "National Commission on Arms Control" (in this title referred to as the "Commission").

SEC. 1504. DUTIES.

(a) STUDY.—The Commission shall conduct a study of the factors which contribute to the global proliferation of strategic and conventional military weapons and related equipment and the technology necessary to produce such weapons and equipment.

(b) CONDUCT OF STUDY.—In carrying out the study under subsection (a), the Commission shall—

(1) identify those factors contributing to global weapons proliferation which can be most effectively regulated;

(2) study the factors essential to promoting and implementing a policy of redirecting and converting existing foreign and domestic defense industries from the production of strategic and conventional military weapons and related equipment to the production and distribution of non-military goods and services;

(3) examine the training program options required for defense industry personnel likely to be directly affected by any program aimed at conversion of defense industries to civilian purposes;

(4) identify and assess policy approaches the United States could utilize to discourage transfers of strategic and conventional military weapons and related equipment and the technology necessary to produce such weapons and equipment to developing nations;

(5) assess the effectiveness of current multilateral efforts to control transfers of such military weapons and related equipment and the technology necessary to produce such

weapons and equipment to developing nations; and

(6) identify and examine methods by which the United States could independently discourage transfers of such military weapons and related equipment and the technology necessary to produce such weapons and equipment to developing nations, including placing conditions on assistance provided by the United States to such developing nations.

SEC. 1505. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) VOTING MEMBERS.—

(1) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission may be composed of 12 voting members, to be appointed not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, as follows:

(A) 4 members appointed by the President.

(B) 2 members appointed by the majority leader of the Senate.

(C) 2 members appointed by the minority leader of the Senate.

(D) 2 members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(E) 2 members appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—The voting members shall be chosen from among individuals with expertise in defense issues, defense conversion, worker training, arms control, diplomacy or international affairs, business, and international economics.

(b) NONVOTING MEMBERS.—The Commission may appoint not more than 6 nonvoting members who shall be chosen from among—

(1) individuals with expertise in defense conversion and worker training; and

(2) executives from the defense industry, financial institutions, and entities organized for the purpose of conducting interdisciplinary research in political, economic, and social issues.

(c) TERMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each member shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(2) VACANCIES.—A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) BASIC PAY.—

(1) RATES OF PAY.—Except as provided in paragraph 92), each member may be paid at a rate not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay payable for grade GS-17 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, for each day during which such member is engaged in the actual performance of duties of the Commission.

(2) PROHIBITION OF COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Except as provided in subsection (e), members of the Commission who are full-time officers or employees of the United States may not receive additional pay, allowances, or benefits, by reason of their service on the Commission.

(e) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each member may receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(f) QUORUM.—A majority of the voting members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold hearings.

(g) CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson of the Commission shall be elected by a majority of the voting members.

(h) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairperson.

SEC. 1506. DIRECTOR AND STAFF; EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.

(a) DIRECTOR.—The Commission may have a Director, who shall be appointed by the

Chairperson. The Director may be paid at a rate not to exceed the maximum rate of basic pay payable for GS-16 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) STAFF.—Subject to rules prescribed by the commission, the Chairperson may appoint a fix the pay of additional personnel as the Chairperson considers appropriate.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.—The Director and staff of the Commission may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointment in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that an individual so appointed may not receive pay in excess of the annual rate of basic pay payable for GS-16 of the General Schedule.

(d) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals not to exceed the maximum annual rate of basic pay payable for GS-17 of the General Schedule.

(e) STAFF OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Upon request of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of the agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties under section 1504.

SEC. 1507. POWERS.

(a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out section 1504, hold hearings, sit and act at times and places, take testimony, and receive evidence as the Commission considers appropriate. The Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before it.

(b) POWERS OF MEMBERS AND AGENTS.—Any member or agent of the Commission may, if authorized by the Commission, take any action which the Commission is authorized to take by this section.

(c) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission may secure directly from any Federal agency any information necessary to enable the Commission to carry out section 1504. Upon request of the Chairperson of the Commission, the head of the agency shall furnish such information to the Commission to the extent such information is not prohibited from disclosure by law.

(d) MAILS.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other Federal agencies.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.—Upon the request of the Commission, the Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission, on a reimbursable basis, the administrative support services necessary for the Commission to carry out its responsibilities under this Act.

(f) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—The Commission may contract with and compensate government and private agencies or persons for the purpose of conducting research or surveys necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its duties under section 1504, and for other services.

SEC. 1508. REPORT.

Not later than 18 months after the date on which the initial members of the Commission have been appointed under section 1505(a), the Commission shall submit a report to the President and the Congress which shall contain—

(1) a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the study conducted under section 1504; and

(2) recommendations to support and undertake both unilateral and multilateral initiatives to—

(A) stop the global proliferation of strategic and conventional military weapons and related equipment and the technology necessary to produce such weapons and equipment; and

(B) promote and implement the conversion of existing foreign and domestic defense industries from the production of strategic and conventional military weapons and related equipment to the production of non-military goods and services.

SEC. 1509. TERMINATION.

The Commission shall terminate 30 days after submitting its report pursuant to section 1508.

SEC. 1510. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 1993 and 1994 such sums as may be necessary to carry out this title.

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WISE

The amendment as modified is as follows:
At the end of subtitle B of title X (page 332, after line 5), add the following new section:

SEC. 1023. REQUIREMENT TO ESTABLISH PROCEDURES FOR STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO BUY LAW ENFORCEMENT EQUIPMENT IN CONJUNCTION WITH DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 18 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§381. PROCUREMENT BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT EQUIPMENT IN CONJUNCTION WITH DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

“(a) PROCEDURES.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish procedures in accordance with this subsection under which States and units of local government may purchase certain equipment in conjunction with the Department of Defense. The procedures shall require the following:

“(A) Each State desiring to participate in a procurement of equipment in conjunction with the Department of Defense shall submit to the Department, in such form and manner and at such times as the Secretary prescribes (i) a request for law enforcement equipment, and (ii) advance payment for such equipment, in an amount determined by the Secretary based on estimated or actual costs of the equipment. Requests shall be submitted annually or at another frequency determined appropriate by the Secretary.

“(B) A request for law enforcement equipment shall consist of an enumeration of the law enforcement equipment that is desired by the State and units of local government within the State.

“(C) A State requesting law enforcement equipment shall be responsible for arranging and paying for shipment of the equipment to the State and localities within the State.

“(2) In establishing the procedures, the Secretary of Defense shall coordinate with the General Services Administration and other Federal agencies for purposes of avoiding duplication of effort.

“(b) REIMBURSEMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—In the case of any purchase made by a State or unit of local government under the procedures established under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall require the State or unit of local government to reimburse the Department of Defense for the administrative costs to the Department of such purchase.

“(c) GSA CATALOG.—The Administrator of General Services shall produce and maintain

a catalog of law enforcement equipment suitable for purchase by States and units of local government under the procedures established by the Secretary under this section.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

"(1) The term 'State' means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any territory or possession of the United States.

"(2) The term 'unit of local government' means any city, county, township, town, borough, parish, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State; an Indian tribe which performs law enforcement functions as determined by the Secretary of the Interior; or any agency of the District of Columbia government or the United States Government performing law enforcement functions in and for the District of Columbia or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(3) The term 'law enforcement equipment' has the meaning given such term in regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. Such term includes, at a minimum, handguns, bulletproof vests, and communication equipment."

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"381. Procurement by State and local governments of law enforcement equipment in conjunction with Department of Defense."

(b) DEADLINE.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish procedures under section 381(a) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report on the procedures established pursuant to section 381 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a). The report shall include, at a minimum, a list of the law enforcement equipment that will be covered under such procedures.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HANSEN

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII of the bill (page 516, after line 6), add the following new section:

SEC. 2819. LIMITATIONS ON THE REMOVAL OR DISPOSAL OF PERSONAL PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT IN CONNECTION WITH THE CLOSURE OR MAJOR REALIGNMENT OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in this section, in connection with the closure or major realignment of a military installation pursuant to a base closure law, the Secretary of Defense shall not permit the removal or disposal of any related personal property that—

(1) is located at the installation; and
(2) would be suitable for use by a governmental or private entity obtaining real property at the installation.

(b) AUTHORIZED REMOVALS AND DISPOSALS.—The limitation specified in subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the removal or disposal of related personal property from a military installation if—

(1) the property is regularly transferred or removed from the installation, such as in the case of military vehicles and aircraft;

(2) the property is unique to the military and its removal is required to support a specific mission of the Armed Forces; or

(3) the removal or disposal is pursuant to a reuse plan for the installation that is approved by the Secretary and consistent with the inventory requirements specified in subsections (c) and (d).

(c) INVENTORY OF RELATED PERSONAL PROPERTY.—As soon as practicable following the selection of a military installation for closure or major realignment pursuant to a base closure law, the Secretary of the military department exercising jurisdiction over the installation shall order an inventory to be taken of related personal property at the installation.

(d) SELECTION OF PERSONAL PROPERTY FOR RETENTION AT INSTALLATION.—Upon completion of the inventory under subsection (c) for a military installation, the entity recognized by the Secretary of Defense as developing the community base reuse plan for the installation shall be given not less than 12 months within which to decide whether or not to retain all or a portion of the related personal property at the installation.

(e) DISPOSAL AUTHORITY.—As consideration for the property selected by the entity under subsection (d) to be retained at the installation, the Secretary of Defense may require the entity to pay to the United States such amount, not to exceed the fair market value of the retained property, as the Secretary considers to be appropriate. Related personal property that is not retained by the entity at the installation shall be removed or disposed of by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (b)(3).

(f) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) BASE CLOSURE LAW DEFINED.—The term "base closure law" means each of the following:

(A) The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

(B) Title II of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100-526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

(C) Section 2687 of title 10, United States Code.

(D) Any other similar law enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) RELATED PERSONAL PROPERTY DEFINED.—The term "related personal property" means any personal property owned by the United States that—

(A) is an integral part of real property at a military installation or is related to, designated for, or specially adapted to the functional or productive capacity of the real property, and the removal of this personal property would significantly diminish the economic value of the real property; or
(B) is essential to implement a community base reuse plan and to make the installation fully functional for civilian operations, including such personal property as office furniture and equipment, machine tools and industrial production equipment, dormitory and food service equipment, airport operating equipment, educational and instructional equipment, and spare parts for such personal property sufficient to cover the initial three years of civilian operations.

(3) MAJOR REALIGNMENT.—The term "major realignment" means any action under a base closure law that—

(A) reduces and relocates functions and civilian personnel positions at a military installation; and
(B) affects 500 or more employees at the installation.

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SNOWE

The amendment as modified is as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVII (page 516, after line 6), insert the following new section:

SEC. 2819. PREFERENCE FOR LOCAL AND SMALL BUSINESSES.

(a) PREFERENCE REQUIRED.—In entering into contracts with private entities as part of the closure or realignment of a military installation under a base closure law, the Secretary of Defense shall give preference, to the greatest extent practicable, to qualified businesses located in the vicinity of the installation and small business concerns. Contracts for which this preference shall be given shall include contracts to carry out activities for the environmental restoration and mitigation at a military installation to be closed or realigned.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term "small business concern" has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

(2) The term "base closure law" means the following:

(A) The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 104 Stat. 1808; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

(B) Title II of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100-526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

(C) Section 2687 of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWDER

At the end of title XXI (page 464, after line 13) insert the following new section:

SEC. . CONSTRUCTION OF CHEMICAL MUNITIONS DISPOSAL FACILITIES.

(a) LIMITATION ON CONSTRUCTION.—None of the amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a) may be obligated for the construction of a new chemical munitions disposal facility at Anniston Army Depot, Alabama, until the Secretary of Defense submits a certification described in subsection (b).

(b) CERTIFICATION.—A certification referred to in subsection (a) is a certification submitted by the Secretary of Defense to Congress that—

(1) the Johnston Atoll Chemical Agent Disposal System has been fully operational for a period of six consecutive months, has met all required environmental and safety standards, and has proven to be operationally effective; and

(2) if the Secretary of the Army awards a construction contract for the chemical munitions disposal facility at Anniston Army Depot, Alabama, the Secretary of the Army will schedule the award of a construction contract for a chemical munitions disposal facility at another non-low-volume chemical weapons storage site in the continental United States during the same 12-month period in which the construction contract for the facility at the Anniston Army Depot is awarded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STUPAK

At the end of section 1321 of the bill (page 386, after line 20), insert the following new subsection:

(c) FEASIBILITY STUDY TO GUARANTEE ASSISTANCE TO ADVERSELY AFFECTED COMMUNITIES.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of assisting local communities recovering from the adverse economic impact of the closure or major realignment of a military installation under a base closure law by reserving for grants to the communities under section 2391(b) of title 10, United States Code,

an amount equal to not less than 10 percent of the total projected savings to be realized by the Department of Defense in the first 10 years after the closure or major realignment of the installation as a result of the closure or realignment.

(2) Not later than March 1, 1994, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress containing the results of the study required by this subsection. The report shall include—

(A) an estimate of the amount of the projected savings described in paragraph (1) to be realized by the Department of Defense as a result of each base closure or major realignment underway or announced as of the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) a recommendation regarding the funding sources within the budget for the Department of Defense from which amounts for the grants described in paragraph (1) could be derived.

(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term "base closure law" means each of the following:

(A) The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

(B) Title II of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100-526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOLDEN

At the end of title II (page , after line), insert the following new section:

SEC. . AUTHORIZED USE FOR FACILITY CONSTRUCTED WITH PRIOR DEFENSE GRANT FUNDS.

The plasma are facilities constructed using funds provided under grants made to the South Carolina Research Authority from amounts appropriated in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1988 (Public Law 100-463), and the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-511), may be equipped and operated as prototype materials processing facilities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

Page 274, starting on line 9, strike out "Paragraph" and all that follows through the end of line 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Section 2302 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:"

Page 274, line 12, strike out "(7)" and insert in lieu thereof "(8)".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MACHTLEY

At the end of title VIII (page , after line), insert the following section:

"SEC. 825. AUTHORITY TO DISPOSE OF EQUIPMENT WHOSE OPERATION AND SUPPORT COSTS EXCEED COSTS OF PROCURING REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT.

"(a) AUTHORITY.—(1) Chapter 433 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 4543. Disposal of property: authority to dispose of certain equipment

"(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Army may dispose of equipment that—

"(1) at the discretion of the Secretary, is needed, but whose continued operation and support costs exceed costs of procuring approved replacement equipment; or

"(2) is a major end item and still has commercial utility, such as trucks, trailers, and communications equipment.

"(b) READINESS REQUIREMENTS.—In disposing of equipment under this section, the Secretary shall not compromise the readiness requirements of the Army.

"(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PROCUREMENT OF REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT.—It

is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Army should make every effort to increase the procurement of equipment of the type needed to replace the equipment disposed of under the authority provided by this section."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"4543. Disposal of property: authority to dispose of certain equipment."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKELTON

Strike section 571 (page 5-46, line 2, through page 5-47, line 20).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MONTGOMERY

Page 19, line 2, insert "(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS." before "Funds".

Page 19, after line 11, add the following new subsection:

(b) MULTIPLE-LAUNCH ROCKET SYSTEM.—Of the total number of Multiple-Launch Rocket System units acquired with funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 101 for the Army, the Secretary of the Army shall ensure that one battalion set shall be authorized for and made available to the Army National Guard.

Page 487, line 15, insert "(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS." before "There".

Page 488, after line 7, add the following new subsections:

(b) INCREASE IN ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AUTHORIZATION.—The amount provided in subsection (a)(1)(A) for the Army National Guard of the United States is hereby increased by \$4,867,000.

(c) OFFSETTING REDUCTION.—The amount provided in section 2104(a) for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Army, and the amount provided in paragraph (3) of such section for construction of the Chemical Demilitarization Facility, Anniston Army Depot, Alabama, are each hereby reduced by \$4,867,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELDON

Strike out section 1355 (page 436, lines 4 through 8) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 1355. ELIGIBLE SHIPYARDS.

(a) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive any assistance or otherwise to participate in any program carried out under the National Shipbuilding Initiative, a shipyard must be located in the United States and, in the case of a private shipyard, must be owned and operated by a United States company.

(b) DEFINITION OF UNITED STATES COMPANY.—For the purposes of this section, the term "United States company" means a company that is not owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by citizens or nationals of a foreign country. For purposes of the preceding sentence, a company is owned or controlled directly or indirectly by citizens or nationals of a foreign country if—

(1) 50 percent or more of the voting stock of the company is owned by one or more citizens or nationals of the foreign country;

(2) the title to 50 percent or more of the stock of the company is held subject to trust or fiduciary obligations in favor of one or more citizens or nationals of the foreign country;

(3) 50 percent or more of the voting stock of the company is vested in or exercisable on behalf of one or more citizens or nationals of the foreign country; or

(4) in the case of a corporation—

(A) the number of its directors necessary to constitute a quorum are citizens or nationals of the foreign country; or

(B) the corporation is organized under the laws of the foreign country or any subdivision, territory, or possession thereof.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SISISKY

Strike out section 1005 (page 329, lines 1 through 5) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 1005. HUMANITARIAN AND CIVIC ASSISTANCE.

(a) REGULATIONS.—The regulations required to be prescribed under section 401 of title 10, United States Code, shall be prescribed not later than March 1, 1994. In prescribing such regulations, the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the Secretary of State.

(b) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Section 401(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the period the following: ", except that funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance other than funds appropriated pursuant to such paragraph may be obligated for humanitarian and civic assistance under this section only for incidental costs of carrying out such assistance".

(c) NOTIFICATIONS REGARDING HUMANITARIAN RELIEF.—Any notification provided to the appropriate congressional committees with respect to assistance activities under section 2551 of title 10, United States Code, shall include a detailed description of any items for which transportation is provided that are excess nonlethal supplies of the Department of Defense, including the quantity, acquisition value, and value at the time of the transportation, of such items.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out humanitarian and civic assistance activities under sections 401, 402, and 2551 of title 10, United States Code, in the amount of \$48,000,000 for fiscal year 1994.

(e) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ORTIZ

Strike out section 822 (page , line and all that follows through page , line), and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2304 the following new section:

"§ 2304a. Contracts: prohibition on competition between Department of Defense and small businesses and certain other entities

"(a) EXCLUSION.—In any case in which the Secretary of Defense plans to use competitive procedures for a procurement, if the procurement is to be conducted as described in subsection (b), then the Secretary shall exclude the Department of Defense from competing in the procurement.

"(b) PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION.—The requirement to exclude the Department of Defense under subsection (a) applies in the case of a procurement to be conducted by excluding from competition entities in the private sector other than—

"(1) small business concerns in furtherance of section 8 or 15 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637 or 644); or

"(2) entities described in subsection (a)(1) of section 2323 of this title in furtherance of the goal specified in that subsection."

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after

the item relating to section 2304 the following new item:

"2304a. Contracts: prohibition on competition between Department of Defense and small businesses and certain other entities."

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Section 2304a of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLEIN

At the end of subtitle D of title I (page 29, after line 9), insert the following new section:

SEC. 133. USE OF F-16 AIRCRAFT ADVANCE PROCUREMENT FUNDS FOR PROGRAM TERMINATION COSTS.

(a) **FUNDS FOR PROGRAM TERMINATION COSTS.**—Of the amount provided in section 103 for procurement of aircraft for the Air Force, the amount of \$70,800,000 shall be available only for program termination costs for the F-16 aircraft program.

(b) **PROHIBITION OF FUNDS FOR ADVANCE PROCUREMENT.**—None of the amount provided in section 103 for procurement of aircraft for the Air Force shall be available for advance procurement of F-16 aircraft for fiscal year 1995.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PORTER

In section 373 (page , line), delete subsection (a)(1) and insert the following:

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than February 28, 1994, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional committees referred to in paragraph (2) a report on any educational arrangement referred to in subsection (b) that is made by the Secretary of Defense for children residing on military installations in the United States. The report shall include the following:

(A) the assessment and recommendations of the Secretary of Defense regarding the justification of the continuing need for school facilities under any such educational arrangement;

(B) A comprehensive review of the Department of Education Impact Aid program to determine whether the program is meeting its objectives with regard to militarily impacted school districts. The review shall address structural as well as funding concerns.

(C) A review of all militarily-impacted school districts which are experiencing financial difficulties to determine whether those districts are experiencing financial difficulty in whole or in part as a result of their responsibility for educating military dependents. The study should focus on students under section 3(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 238) and include, at a minimum, a review of all militarily-impacted school districts which are on a State's financial watch list. The study should specifically analyze the effect of the financial difficulty on the students served, including social and educational impacts.

(D) An analysis of, and recommendations regarding, how the Impact Aid program may be structurally improved to better meet the educational needs of military dependents and the schools that serve them. The analysis should specifically address whether the Department of Defense should assume a larger responsibility for the education of military dependents.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BAESLER

At the end of title I (page 41, after line 5), insert the following new section:

SEC. 174. CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION PROGRAM.

(a) **SUBMISSION OF REPORTS ON ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGIES.**—Section 173(b)(1) of

the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-484; 106 Stat. 2343) is amended by striking out the period at the end and inserting in lieu thereof "and a period of 90 days has passed following the submission of the report. During such 90-day period, each Chemical Demilitarization Citizens' Advisory Commission in existence on the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 may submit such comments on the report as it considers appropriate to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives."

(b) **EXTENSION OF DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF REVISED CONCEPT PLAN.**—Section 175(d) of such Act (106 Stat. 2344) is amended by striking out "not later than 180 days" and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof "during the 180-day period beginning at the end of the 90-day period following the submission of the report of the Secretary required under section 173."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY

At the end of subtitle C of title X (page 346, after line 23), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1043. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING UNITED STATES POLICY ON PLUTONIUM.

It is the sense of the Congress that the start-up or continued operation of any plutonium separation plant presents serious environmental hazards and increases the risk of proliferation of weapons-usable plutonium and therefore should be suspended until the related environmental and proliferation concerns have been addressed and resolved.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STARK

At the end of subtitle C of title X (page 346, after line 23), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1043. NORTH KOREA AND THE TREATY ON THE NONPROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to which 156 states are party, is the cornerstone of the international nuclear non-proliferation regime.

(2) Any nonnuclear weapon state that is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is obligated to accept International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards on all source or special fissionable material that is within its territory, under its jurisdiction, or carried out under its control anywhere.

(3) The International Atomic Energy Agency is permitted to conduct inspections in a nonnuclear weapon state that is a party to the Treaty at any site, whether or not declared by that state, to ensure that all source or special fissionable material in that state is under safeguards.

(4) North Korea acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a non-nuclear weapons state in December 1985.

(5) North Korea, after acceding to that treaty, refused until 1992 to accept International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards as required under the treaty.

(6) Inspections of North Korea's nuclear materials by the International Atomic Energy Agency suggested discrepancies in North Korea's declarations regarding special nuclear materials.

(7) North Korea has not given a scientifically satisfactory explanation for those discrepancies.

(8) North Korea refused to provide International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors

with full access to two sites for the purposes of verifying its compliance with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

(9) When called upon by the International Atomic Energy Agency to provide such full access as required by the Treaty, North Korea announced its intention to withdraw from the Treaty, effective after the required three months notice.

(10) After intensive negotiations with the United States, North Korea agreed to suspend its intention to withdraw from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and begin consultations with the International Atomic Energy Agency on providing access to its suspect sites.

(b) **CONGRESSIONAL STATEMENTS.**—The Congress—

(1) notes that the continued refusal of North Korea nearly eight years after ratification of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to fully accept International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards raises serious questions regarding a possible North Korean nuclear weapons program;

(2) notes that possession by North Korea of nuclear weapons (A) would threaten peace and stability in Asia, (B) would jeopardize the existing nuclear non-proliferation regime, and (C) would undermine the goal of the United States to extend the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons at the 1995 review conference;

(3) urges continued pressure from the President, United States allies, and the United Nations Security Council on North Korea to adhere to the Treaty and provide full access to the International Atomic Energy Agency in the shortest time possible;

(4) urges that no trade, financial, or other economic benefits be provided to North Korea by the United States or United States allies until North Korea has (A) provided full access to the International Atomic Energy Agency, (B) satisfactorily explained any discrepancies in its declarations of bomb-grade material, and (C) fully demonstrated that it does not have or seek a nuclear weapons capability; and

(5) calls on the President and the international community to take steps to strengthen the international nuclear non-proliferation regime.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARR

At the end of subtitle C of title XXVIII (page 544, after line 3), insert the following new section:

SEC. 2836. CONVEYANCE OF SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY, FORT ORD, CALIFORNIA.

(a) **CONVEYANCE.**—The Secretary of the Army shall convey to the Regents of the University of California and the Trustees of the California State University (in this section referred to as the "recipient institutions") all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain parcels of real property located at Fort Ord, California, and described in subsection (b). The conveyance shall include all land and water rights applicable to the parcels, all air quality permits to operate facilities and air emission reduction credits applicable to the parcels, and all infrastructure and improvements on the parcels.

(b) **DESCRIPTION OF PARCELS.**—The parcels to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall either—

(1) substantially conform to the description of the land and facilities in the Educational Public Benefit Transfer Applications submitted by the recipient institutions with regard to Ford Ord on or before March

8, 1993, as supplemented or amended through September 30, 1993; or

(2) consist of such alternative parcels as shall, after negotiation, be mutually acceptable to the Secretary and the recipient institutions.

(c) **CONDITIONS.**—The conveyance required by subsection (a) shall be subject to the following conditions:

(1) The recipient institutions shall accept the conveyed parcels as is.

(2) The recipient institutions shall agree to provide the United States, its agents and assigns, access to Fort Ord in order to conduct the ongoing Fort Ord Installation Restoration Program and to comply with the responsibilities of the United States under the amendments enacted by the Federal Facility Compliance Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-386; 106 Stat. 1505).

(3) The recipient institutions shall agree to ensure that they and their successors, agents, and assigns do not disrupt, destroy, or impede the remedial actions performed at Fort Ord by the United States, its agents or assigns.

(d) **LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS AND SURVEYS.**—The exact acreage and legal description of the parcels to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by surveys satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of such surveys shall be borne by the recipient institutions.

(e) **ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

At the end of title subtitle C of title I (page 26, after line 16), insert the following new section:

SEC. 124. LONG-TERM LEASE AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN ROLL-ON/ROLL-OFF VESSELS.

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary of the Navy may enter into a long-term lease or charter for not more than five vessels described in subsection (b) without regard to the provisions of section 2401 of title 10, United States Code, or section 9081 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2401 note).

(b) **COVERED VESSELS.**—Subsection (a) applies to roll-on/roll-off (RO/RO) vessels which are required by the Department of Defense for prepositioning or related point-to-point service and which, in the case of vessels for which work is required to make the vessel eligible for such service and for documentation under the laws of the United States, have such work performed in a United States shipyard.

(c) **LIMITATION ON SOURCE OF FUNDS.**—The Secretary may not use funds appropriated for the National Defense Sealift program that are available for construction of vessels to enter into a contract for a lease or charter pursuant to subsection (a).

(d) **CONDITIONS ON OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.**—The Secretary may not enter into a contract for a lease or charter pursuant to subsection (a) unless the contract includes the following provisions:

(1) A statement that the obligation of the United States to make payments under the contract in any fiscal year is subject to appropriations being provided specifically for that fiscal year and specifically for that lease or charter.

(2) A commitment to obligate the necessary amount for each fiscal year covered by the contract when and to the extent that

funds are appropriated for that lease or charter for that fiscal year.

(3) A statement that such a commitment given under paragraph (2) does not constitute an obligation of the United States.

(e) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of subsection (a), the term "long-term lease or charter" has the meaning given that term in section 2401(d)(1)(A) of title 10, United States Code (without regard to subparagraph (B) of that section).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZIMMER

At the end of title subtitle C of title II (page 70, after line 19), insert the following new section:

SEC. 244. CLEMENTINE SATELLITE PROGRAM.

(a) **FINDING.**—The Congress finds that the program of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization within the Follow-on programs program element that is known as the "Clementine" program, consisting of a satellite space project that will, among other matters, provide valuable information about asteroids in the vicinity of Earth, represents an important opportunity for transfer of Department of Defense technology for civilian purposes and should be supported.

(b) **CONGRESSIONAL VIEWS.**—The Congress urges the Secretary of Defense—

(1) to consider funding for the Clementine program to be a priority within the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization Follow-on programs program element and to provide funds for that program at appropriate levels; and

(2) to identify and appropriate management structure within either the Advanced Research Projects Agency or one of the military departments to which the Clementine program and related programs of general applicability to civilian, commercial, and military space programs might be transferred.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Page 380, strike out line 14 through 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) The Secretary may increase the Federal share of the costs of partnership activities to not more than 70 percent of such costs in the case of a partnership in which the entity proposing the partnership and a majority of the non-Federal participants—

"(A) are small business concerns; and

"(B) are determined by the Secretary to have individually contributed a significant equity percentage toward the non-Federal contribution in relation, if applicable, to the participants that are not small business concerns."

Page 381, line 3, insert after "such costs" the following: " , unless the small business concern is participating in a partnership receiving the financial commitment arrangement authorized in paragraph (2) of the Secretary determines that the small business concern has not made a significant equity percentage contribution in the partnership from non-Federal sources".

Page 381, strike out lines 12 through 16, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) The Secretary may increase the Federal share of the costs of partnership activities to not more than 70 percent of such costs in the case of a partnership in which the entity proposing the partnership and a majority of the non-Federal participants—

"(A) are small business concerns; and

"(B) are determined by the Secretary to have individually contributed a significant equity percentage toward the non-Federal contribution in relation, if applicable, to the participants that are not small business concerns."

Page 382, line 2, insert after "such costs" the following: " , unless the small business

concern is participating in a partnership receiving the financial commitment arrangement authorized in paragraph (2) and the Secretary determines that the small business concern has not made a significant equity percentage contribution in the partnership from non-Federal sources".

Page 382, strike out lines 7 through 13, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) The Secretary may increase the amount of assistance provide under paragraph (1) up to an amount not exceeding 70 percent of the cost of the activities of a regional technology alliance in the case of a regional technology alliance in which the entity proposing the alliance and a majority of the non-Federal participants—

"(A) are small business concerns; and

"(B) are determined by the Secretary to have individually contributed a significant equity percentage toward the non-Federal contribution in relation, if applicable, to the participants that are not small business concerns." ; and

Page 383, line 5, insert after "such costs" the following: " , unless the small business concern is participating in an alliance receiving the financial commitment arrangement authorized in subsection (d)(4) and the Secretary determines that the small business concern has not made a significant equity percentage contribution in the alliance from non-Federal sources".

Page 383, line 17, strike out "business concerns." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "business concerns and are determined by the Secretary to have individually contributed a significant equity percentage toward the non-Federal contribution in relation, if applicable, to the participants that are not small business concerns." ;

Page 384, line 13, insert after "such costs" the following: " , unless the small business concern is participating in a program receiving the increased Federal share arrangement authorized in subparagraph (A) and the Secretary determines that the small business concern has not made a significant equity percentage contribution in the program from non-Federal sources".

Page 384, strike out line 23 and all that follows through line 2 on page 385, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) The Secretary may increase the Federal share of the costs of a program under this section to not more than 70 percent of such costs in the case of a program in which the entity proposing the program and a majority of the non-Federal participants—

"(A) are small business concerns; and

"(B) are determined by the Secretary to have individually contributed a significant equity percentage toward the non-Federal contribution in relation, if applicable, to the participants that are not small business concerns."

Page 385, line 13, insert after "such costs" the following: " , unless the small business concern is participating in a program receiving the financial commitment arrangement authorized in paragraph (2) and the Secretary determines that the small business concern has not made a significant equity percentage contribution in the program from non-Federal sources".

Page 386, line 3, strike out the close quotation marks and the final period.

Page 386, after line 3, insert the following new paragraph:

"(15) The term 'significant equity percentage' means—

"(A) a level of contribution and participation determined, when compared to the other non-Federal participants, to demonstrate a

comparable long-term financial commitment to the product or process development involved; and

"(B) any other criteria the Secretary may consider necessary to ensure an appropriate equity mix among the participants."

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PICKETT

The amendment as modified is as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title III (page 134, after line 16), insert the following new section:

SEC. 375. SHIPS' STORES.

(a) CONVERSION TO OPERATION AS NON-APPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITIES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall convert the operation of all ships' stores from operation as an activity funded by direct appropriations to operation by the Navy Exchange Command as an activity funded from sources other than appropriated funds.

(b) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—To facilitate the conversion required under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer to the Navy Exchange Command from—

(1) the Navy Stock Fund, an amount equal to the value of existing ships' stores assets in that Fund; and

(2) the Ships' Stores Profits, Navy Fund, residual cash in that Fund.

(c) CODIFICATION.—Section 7604 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—" before "Under such regulations"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(b) INCIDENTAL SERVICES.—The Secretary of the Navy may provide financial services, space, utilities, and labor to ships' stores on a nonreimbursable basis.

"(c) ITEMS SOLD.—Merchandise sold by ship stores afloat shall include items in the following categories:

"(1) Health, beauty, and barber items.
 "(2) Pre-recorded music and videos.
 "(3) Photographic batteries and related supplies.

"(4) Appliances and accessories.
 "(5) Uniform items, emblematic and athletic clothing, and equipment.

"(6) Luggage and leather goods.

"(7) Stationery, magazines, books, and supplies.

"(8) Sundries, games, and souvenirs.

"(9) Beverages and related food and snacks.

"(10) Tobacco products."

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsections (b) and (c) of section 7604 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (c), shall take effect on the date on which the Secretary of the Navy completes the conversion referred to in subsection (a).

Page 295, line 15, insert "exchange, commissary, and nonappropriated fund activities," after "family matters."

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUTTO

The amendment as modified is as follows:

At the end of title X (page 346, after line 23), insert the following section:

SEC. 1043. AVIATION LEADERSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) the training of pilots from the air forces of friendly foreign nations in the United States furthers United States interests, promotes closer relations, and advances the national security.

(2) Many friendly foreign nations cannot afford to reimburse the United States for the cost of such training provided.

(3) It is in the national interest to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish a program of pilot training for personnel of the air forces of friendly, less developed foreign nations.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—Part III of subtitle D of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 903 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 905—AVIATION LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

"Sec.

"9381. Establishment of program.

"9382. Supplies and clothing.

"9383. Allowances.

"§ 9381. Establishment of program

"The Secretary of the Air Force may establish and maintain an Aviation Leadership Program which will provide undergraduate pilot training and necessary related training (including, but not limited to, language training and programs to promote better awareness and understanding of the democratic institutions and social framework of the United States) to selected personnel of the air forces of friendly, less-developed foreign nations.

"§ 9382. Supplies and clothing

"(a) The Secretary of the Air Force may, under such conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, provide to persons receiving training under this chapter—

"(1) transportation incident to such training;

"(2) supplies and equipment for the use of such persons during training;

"(3) flight clothing and other special clothing required for training; and

"(4) billeting, food, and health services.

"(b) The Secretary may authorize such expenditures from the appropriations of the Air Force as the Secretary considers for the efficient and effective maintenance of the Program in accordance with this chapter.

"§ 9383. Allowances

"The Secretary of the Air Force may pay to persons receiving training under this chapter a living allowance at a rate to be prescribed by the Secretary, taking into account the amount of living allowances authorized by members of the armed forces under similar circumstances."

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters at the beginning of subtitle D of title 10, United States Code, and part III of such subtitle are amended by inserting after the items relating to chapter 903 the following new item:

"905. Aviation Leadership Program ... 9381".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY

At the end of title II (page 81, after line 23), insert the following section:

SEC. 266. GRANT TO SUPPORT ESTABLISHMENT OF RESEARCH FACILITY TO STUDY LOW-LEVEL CHEMICAL SENSITIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall make a grant in the amount of \$1,200,000 to a medical research institution selected through established acquisition procedures for the purpose of constructing and equipping a specialized environmental medical facility at that institution with the purpose of studying the possible health effects of exposure to low levels of volatile organic chemicals and other substances and the individual susceptibility of humans to such exposure under environmentally controlled conditions, especially among persons who served on active duty in the Southwest Asia theater of operation during the Persian War.

(b) FUNDING SOURCE.—Funds for the grant under subsection (a) shall be made from amounts appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1994 for research, development, test, and evaluation.

(c) SELECTION CRITERIA.—To be eligible to be selected for a grant under subsection (a), an institution—

(1) must be affiliated with an accredited hospital and be affiliated with, and in close proximity to, a Department of Defense medical center and a Department of Veterans Affairs medical center;

(2) must enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Defense to ensure that research personnel of those affiliated medical facilities and other relevant Federal personnel may have access to the facility to carry out research;

(3) must have demonstrated potential or ability to ensure the participation of scientific personnel with expertise in research on possible chemical sensitivities to low-level exposure to volatile organic chemicals and other substances; and

(4) must have immediate access to sophisticated physiological imaging (including functional brain imaging) and other innovative research technology that could better define the possible health effects of low-level exposure to volatile organic chemicals and other substances and lead to new therapies.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL OF OHIO

At the end of subtitle A of title XIII (page 386, after line 3), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1318. ADDITIONAL CRITERIA FOR THE SELECTION OF REGIONAL TECHNOLOGY ALLIANCES.

Section 2513(h) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (7); and

(2) by striking out paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(4) The potential for the regional technology alliance to combine financial assistance provided under this section with assistance available from other Federal, State, or local agencies, institutions of higher education, and private nonprofit entities.

"(5) The potential for the regional technology alliance to increase industrial competitiveness.

"(6) The potential for the regional technology alliance to meet the needs of small- and medium-sized defense-dependent companies across multiple activity areas including—

"(A) outreach;
 "(B) manufacturing education and training;

"(C) technology development;

"(D) technology deployment; and

"(E) business counseling."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

At the end of subtitle G of title III (page 143, after line 16), insert the following new section:

SEC. 383. ANNUAL REPORT ON REIMBURSEMENT OF CONTRACTOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSE COSTS FOR OTHER THAN RESPONSE ACTION CONTRACTORS.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 2706 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) REPORT ON REIMBURSEMENT OF CONTRACTOR COSTS.—(1) Each year, at the same time the President submits to the Congress the budget for a fiscal year (pursuant to section 1105 of title 31), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the committees named in paragraph (3) a report on payments made by

the Secretary of Defense for defense contractor environmental response costs.

"(2) Each report required by paragraph (1) shall include, for the recently completed fiscal year—

"(A) estimated payments made by the Secretary of Defense to a defense contractor (other than a response action contractor) for environmental response costs at facilities owned or operated by the defense contractor or at which the defense contractor is liable in whole or in part for the environmental response action; and

"(B) the amount and current status of any pending requests by a defense contractor (other than a response action contractor) for payment of environmental response costs at facilities owned or operated by the defense contractor or at which the defense contractor is liable in whole or in part for the environmental response action.

"(3) The committees of Congress to which a report under paragraph (1) is to be submitted are the following:

"(A) The Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

"(B) The Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

"(C) The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

"(D) The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

"(E) The Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives.

"(F) The Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate."

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1992, except that for fiscal years 1992 and 1993, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report required by such amendment to the committees named in subsection (c) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term "defense contractor"—

(A) means a company that is one of the top 100 companies receiving the largest dollar volume of prime contract awards by the Department of Defense during the fiscal year covered by the report required by section 2706(c) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a); and

(B) does not include small business concerns, commercial companies providing commercial items to the Department of Defense, or segments or commercial companies providing commercial items to the Department of Defense.

(2) The terms "facility", "response", and "response action contractor" have the meaning given such terms in paragraphs (9) and (25) of section 101, and in section 119(e)(2), respectively, of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(9) and (25), 9619(e)(2)).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

At the end of subtitle D of title I (page 29, after line 9), insert the following new section:

SEC. . C-17 AIRCRAFT PROGRAM.

(a) **WITHHOLDING OF PAYMENTS FOR SOFTWARE NONCOMPLIANCE.**—In accepting further delivery of C-17 aircraft that in accordance with existing C-17 contracts require a waiver for software noncompliance, the Secretary of Defense shall withhold from the unliquidated portion of the progress payments for such aircraft an amount not less than 1 percent of the total cost of such aircraft. The withholding shall continue until the Secretary submits to each of the congressional commit-

tees named in subsection (e) a report in which the Secretary certifies each of the following:

(1) That C-17 software testing and avionics integration have been completed.

(2) That the costs of waivers for software noncompliance have been identified and are in accordance with the terms of existing C-17 contracts.

(b) **CORRECTION OF WING DEFECTS.**—Within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to each of the congressional committees named in subsection (e) a report in which the Secretary certifies that, in accordance with the terms of existing C-17 contracts, the contractor has identified and is bearing each of the following:

(1) The costs related to wing structural deficiencies (including the costs of redesign, static wing failure repair, and retrofit for existing wing sets).

(2) The costs for required redesign, retesting, and manufacture of C-17 slats and flaps to correct identified deficiencies.

(c) **ANALYSIS OF RANGE/PAYLOAD DEFICIENCY.**—Within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to each of the congressional committees named in subsection (e) a report containing the following:

(1) An analysis of the operational impacts caused by deficiencies in the range/payload specification, as defined by the C-17 Lot III production contract, including projected operational and maintenance costs, such as the costs of required airborne refueling due to range shortfalls.

(2) A schedule for securing from the contractor, in accordance with the terms of existing C-17 contracts, an equitable recovery for the operational impacts caused by deficiencies in the range/payload specification identified in the analysis required by this section.

(d) **REPORT CONTENTS.**—Each report required by this section shall include an itemization of the estimated effect on total production costs caused by software noncompliance, wing defects, or range/payload deficiency, as applicable.

(e) **CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The committees of Congress to which a report required by this section is to be submitted are the following:

(1) The Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(2) The Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(3) The Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS OF MAINE

At the end of section 102 (page 18, after line 6), insert the following new subsection:

(c) **ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR PRODUCTION DESIGN SUPPORT FOR DDG-51 PROGRAM.**—Within the amount provided in subsection (a)(3) for shipbuilding and conversion—

(1) the amount available for Production Design Support for the DDG-51 program is hereby increased by \$38,459,000; and

(2) the amount available for Outfitting is hereby reduced by \$38,459,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SCHROEDER

At the end of subtitle C of title XIII (page after line), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1337. AMENDMENTS TO DEFENSE DIVERSIFICATION PROGRAM UNDER JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT.

(a) **DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.**—Section 325A(k)(1) of the Job Training Partnership Act is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking out "and" after the semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

"(D) projects involving teams of transition assistance specialists from Federal, State, and local agencies to provide onsite services, including assisting affected communities in short-term and long-term planning and assisting affected individuals through counseling and referrals to appropriate services, at the site of such reductions or closures within 60 days of the announcement of such reductions or closures;

"(E) projects to assist in establishing transition assistance centers at the installations where large dislocations occur to provide comprehensive services to individuals affected by such dislocations;

"(F) projects involving the joint efforts of Federal agencies, such as the Department of Labor, the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, and the Small Business Administration, to assist communities affected by such reductions or closures in developing integrated community planning processes to facilitate the retraining of affected individuals and the conversion of installations to commercial uses;

"(G) projects to develop new information and data systems to assist individuals and communities affected by such reductions or closures, including—

"(i) the development of data bases with the capability to provide an affected individual with a civilian economy skills profile which takes into account the skills acquired while working on defense-related matters; and

"(H) projects to assist small- and medium-sized firms affected by such reductions or closures in the formation of learning consortia, which will promote joint efforts for staff training, human resource development, product development, and the marketing of products."

(b) **STAFF TRAINING, ADMINISTRATION, AND COORDINATION.**—Section 325A of the Job Training Partnership Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (l) as subsection (o); and

(2) by adding the following new subsections after subsection (k):

"(l) **STAFF TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—In carrying out the grant program established under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense may provide staff training and technical assistance services to States, communities, businesses, and labor organizations, and other entities involved in providing adjustment assistance to workers.

"(m) **ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—Not more than 2 percent of funds available to the Secretary of Defense to carry out this section for any fiscal year may be retained by the Secretary of Defense for the administration of activities authorized under this section.

"(n) **COORDINATION WITH TECHNOLOGY REINVESTMENT PROJECTS.**—The Secretary of defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall ensure that activities carried out under this section are coordinated with relevant activities carried out pursuant to title IV of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102-396; 106 Stat. 1890)."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HANSEN

At the end of subtitle A of title X (page 329, after line 25), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1008. FUNDING STRUCTURE FOR CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 3 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 127 the following new section:

"§ 127a. Expenses for contingency operations

"(a) DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.—The funding procedures prescribed by this section apply with respect to any operation involving the armed forces that is designated by the Secretary of Defense as a National Contingency Operation. Whenever the Secretary designates an operation as a National Contingency Operation, the Secretary shall promptly transmit notice of that designation in writing to Congress. This section does not provide authority for the President or the Secretary of Defense to carry out an operation, but applies to the Department of Defense mechanisms by which funds are provided for operations that the armed forces are required to carry out under some other authority.

"(b) WAIVER OF REQUIREMENT TO REIMBURSE SUPPORT UNITS.—(1) When an operating unit of the Armed Forces participating in a National Contingency Operation receives support services from a support unit of the Armed Forces that operates through the Defense Business Operations Fund (or a successor fund), that operating unit need not reimburse that support unit for the incremental costs incurred by the support unit in providing such support, notwithstanding any other provision of law or Government accounting practice.

"(2) The amounts which but for paragraph (1) would be required to be reimbursed to a support unit shall be recorded as an expense attributable to the operation and shall be accounted for separately.

"(c) OBLIGATIONAL LIMITATIONS.—(1) Obligations attributable to a National Contingency Operation for which customary reimbursement requirements are not applicable by reason of subsection (b) may not be made in excess of \$20,000,000 until the President submits to Congress notice of the intention to make such obligations in excess of \$20,000,000.

"(2) Upon such notification under paragraph (1), an additional \$20,000,000 in obligations attributable to that operation for which customary reimbursement requirements are not applicable by reason of subsection (b) may be made.

"(3) Obligations attributable to a National Contingency Operation for which customary reimbursement requirements are not applicable by reason of subsection (b) may be made in excess of \$40,000,000—

"(A) only after the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which a presidential notification is submitted under paragraph (2); and

"(B) only if during that 30-day period a joint resolution described in subsection (i) is not enacted into law.

"(4) The President may waive the limitation in paragraph (3) in the case of any National Contingency Operation with respect to which the President has declared a national emergency.

"(d) NOTIFICATION AND PLAN FOR LARGE-SCALE OPERATIONS.—(1) Within two months of the beginning of any large-scale or long-term National Contingency Operation, the President shall submit to Congress a financial plan for the operation that sets forth the manner by which the President proposes to obtain funds for the full cost to the United States of the operation.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection, a large-scale or long-term National Contingency

Operation is an operation designated as a National Contingency Operation that was not anticipated and programmed for in the budget for the current fiscal year and which is expected—

"(A) to have a duration in excess of three months; or

"(B) to have an incremental cost to the Department of Defense in excess of \$100,000,000.

"(e) INCREMENTAL COSTS.—For purposes of this section, incremental costs of the Department of Defense with respect to an operation are the costs that are directly attributable to the operation and that are otherwise chargeable to accounts available for operation and maintenance or for military personnel. Any costs which are otherwise chargeable to accounts available for procurement may not be considered to be incremental costs for purposes of this section.

"(f) INCREMENTAL PERSONNEL COSTS ACCOUNT.—(1) There is hereby established in the Department of Defense a reserve fund to be known as the 'National Contingency Operation Personnel Fund'. Amounts in the fund shall be available for incremental military personnel costs attributable to a National Contingency Operation. Amounts in the fund remain available until expended.

"(2) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1994 to the fund established under paragraph (1) the sum of \$10,000,000.

"(g) COORDINATION WITH WAR POWERS RESOLUTION.—This section may not be construed as altering or superseding the War Powers Resolution. This section does not provide authority to conduct a National Contingency Operation or any other operation.

"(h) GAO COMPLIANCE REVIEWS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall from time to time, and when requested by a committee of Congress, conduct a review of the defense contingency funding structure under this section to determine whether the Department of Defense is complying with the requirements and limitations of this section.

"(i) PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERING RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—(1) For purposes of subsection (c)(3), the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution that is introduced within the 10-day period beginning on the date on which the President transmits to Congress the notification under that subsection and—

"(A) that does not have a preamble;

"(B) the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That the President may not incur obligations in excess of \$40,000,000 as proposed in the notice of the President of ', the blank space being filled in with the appropriate date; and

"(C) the title of which is as follows: 'Joint resolution limiting obligations by the President.'"

"(2) A resolution described in paragraph (1) that is introduced in the House of Representatives shall be referred jointly to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives. A resolution described in paragraph (1) that is introduced in the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

"(3) If the committees to which a resolution described in paragraph (1) is referred have not reported such resolution (or an identical resolution) by the end of the 15-day period beginning on the date on which the President transmits the applicable notice to Congress under subsection (c), such committees shall be, at the end of such period, discharged from further consideration of such

resolution, and such resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar of the House involved.

"(4)(A) On or after the third day after the date on which the committees to which such a resolution is referred have reported, or have been discharged (under paragraph (3)) from further consideration of, such a resolution, it is in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for any Member of the respective House to move to proceed to the consideration of the resolution. A Member may make the motion only on the day after the calendar day on which the Member announces to the House concerned the Member's intention to make the motion, except that, in the case of the House of Representatives, if the motion is made by direction of the committee to which the resolution was referred. All points of order against the resolution (and against consideration of the resolution) are waived. The motion is highly privileged in the House of Representatives and is privileged in the Senate and is not debatable. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution is agreed to, the respective House shall immediately proceed to consideration of the joint resolution without intervening motion, order, or other business, and the resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the respective House until disposed of.

"(B) Debate on the resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. An amendment to the resolution is not in order. A motion further to limit debate is in order and not debatable. A motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the resolution is not in order. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to is not in order.

"(C) Immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a resolution described in paragraph (1) and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the appropriate House, the vote on final passage of the resolution shall occur.

"(D) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

"(5)(A) If, before the passage by one House of a resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply:

"(i) The resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee and may not be considered in the House receiving it except in the case of final passage as provided in clause (ii)(II).

"(ii) With respect to a resolution described in paragraph (1) of the House receiving the resolution—

"(I) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no resolution had been received from the other House; but

"(II) the vote on final passage shall be on the resolution of the other House.

"(B) Upon disposition of the resolution received from the other House, it shall no longer be in order to consider the resolution that originated in the receiving House.

"(6) This subsection is enacted by Congress—

"(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a resolution described in paragraph (1), and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

"(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 127 the following new item:

"127a. Expenses for contingency operations."

MODIFICATION TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

The amendment as modified is as follows:

At the end of section 1206 (page 361, after line 8), add the following new subsection:

(e) REMOVAL OF RUSSIAN FORCES FROM THE BALTIC STATES.—(1) Paragraph (5) of section 498A(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"(5) for the Government of Russia until the President certifies to the Congress that the Government of Russia—

"(A) has made further significant progress since the President's certification of the Congress on May 31, 1993, on the removal of all of the armed forces of Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania (including any units of such forces that are demobilized), or has completed with the governments of such countries negotiated agreements that include timetables for such removal; and

"(B) has undertaken good faith efforts, such as negotiations, to end other military practices by Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States that violate the sovereignty of Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania, including—

"(i) artillery or similar armed forces training operations on the territories of Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania without the permission of their governments;

"(ii) interference in the air space or territorial waters of Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania;

"(iii) the introduction of additional armed forces, military equipment, or related civilian personnel onto the territories of Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania without the permission of their governments; or

"(iv) the imposition of an economic blockade or interruption of energy supplies upon Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania;

except that this paragraph does not apply with respect to (I) housing assistance for officers of the armed forces of Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States who are withdrawn from the territories of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, or (II) food, clothing, medicine, or other humanitarian assistance."

(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the later of (A) October 1, 1993, or (B) the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) The provisions of paragraph (1) shall not apply if an identical amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is enacted in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1993.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SPENCE

In section 3103 of the bill (page 562, after line 15), add at the end the following new subsections:

(e) ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.—Of the amount provided under subsection (a)(7) for worker training and adjustment, \$6,000,000 shall be available for providing economic assistance and development funding for local counties or localities containing the property of the Department of Energy defense nuclear facility known as the Savannah River Site. To the extent practicable, the amount of assistance to be provided should be distributed as follows:

(1) \$1,000,000 to plan community adjustments and economic diversification.

(2) \$5,000,000 to carry out a community adjustments and economic diversification program.

(f) USE OF TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER FUNDS AT THE SAVANNAH RIVER SITE.—Of amounts authorized to be appropriated in section 3101 for research and development and in this section for nuclear materials support and other defense programs, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$4,000,000 for technology transfer activities at the Department of Energy defense production facility at the Savannah River Site, South Carolina.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

At the end of subtitle A of title II (page 42, after line 23), insert the following new section:

SEC. 203. REENTRY VEHICLE INDUSTRIAL BASE.

Of the amount authorized to be appropriated pursuant to section 201 for the Navy, \$5,000,000 shall be available for the contribution of the Navy for fiscal year 1994 to the Reentry Vehicle industrial base.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

Strike out section 2833 (page 540, line 8, through line 2, page 541) and insert in lieu thereof the following new section:

SEC. 2833. MODIFICATION OF LEASE AUTHORITY, NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA.

(a) EXPANSION OF LEASE AUTHORITY.—Paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 2834 of the Military Construction Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1993 (division B of Public Law 102-484; 106 Stat. 2614) is amended by striking out "not more than 195 acres of real property" and all that follows through the period and inserting in lieu thereof "those portions of the Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California, that the Secretary determines to be available for lease."

(b) CONSIDERATION.—Paragraph (2) of such subsection is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (A);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(C) be for nominal consideration."

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such subsection is further amended—

(1) by striking out paragraphs (3), (4), and (5); and

(2) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (3).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

At the end of title X (page , after line), add the following:

SEC. . PUBLIC PURPOSE EXTENSIONS.

Section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 484) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c) in the first sentence by inserting "or (q)" after "subsection (p)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(q)(1) Under such regulations as the Administrator, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, may prescribe, the Administrator, or the Secretary of Defense in the case of property located at a military installation closed or realigned pursuant to the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100-526), the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-510), or section 2687 of title 10, United States Code, may, in his or her discretion, assign to the Secretary of Transportation for disposal such surplus real property, including buildings, fixtures, and equipment situated thereon, as is recommended by the Secretary of Transportation as being needed for the development or operation of a port facility.

"(2) Subject to the disapproval of the Administrator or the Secretary of Defense within 30 days after notice by the Secretary of Transportation of a proposed conveyance of property for any of the purposes described in paragraph (1), the Secretary of Transportation, through such officers or employees of the Department of Transportation as he or she may designate, may convey, at no consideration to the United States, such surplus real property, including buildings, fixtures, and equipment situated thereon, for use in the development or operation of a port facility to any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or any political subdivision, municipality, or instrumentality thereof.

"(3) No transfer of property may be made under this paragraph until the Secretary of Transportation has—

"(A) determined, after consultation with the Secretary of Labor, that the surplus real property to be conveyed is located in an area of serious economic disruption;

"(B) received and, after consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, approved an economic development plan submitted by an eligible grantee and based on assured use of the property to be conveyed as part of a necessary economic development program; and

"(C) provided an explanatory statement as specified in subsection (e)(6).

"(4) The instrument of conveyance of any surplus real property and related personal property disposed of under this subsection shall—

"(A) provide that all such property shall be used and maintained in perpetuity for the purpose for which it was conveyed, and that if the property ceases to be used or maintained for that purpose, all or any portion of the property shall, in its then existing condition, at the option of the United States, revert to the United States; and

"(B) contain such additional terms, reservations, restrictions, and conditions as the Secretary of Transportation shall by regulation require to assure use of the property for the purposes for which it was conveyed and to safeguard the interests of the United States.

"(5) With respect to surplus real property and related personal property conveyed pursuant to this subsection, the Secretary of Transportation shall—

"(A) determine and enforce compliance with the terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions contained in any instrument by which such conveyance was made;

"(B) reform, correct, or amend any such instrument by the execution of a corrective,

reformatory, or amendatory instrument if necessary to correct such instrument or to conform such conveyance to the requirements of applicable law; and

"(C)(i) grant releases from any of the terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions contained in, and (ii) convey, quitclaim, or release to the grantee any right or interest reserved to the United States by, any instrument by which such conveyance was made, if the Secretary of Transportation determines that the property so conveyed no longer serves the purpose for which it was conveyed, or that such release, conveyance, or quitclaim deed will not prevent accomplishment of the purpose for which such property was so conveyed, except that any such release, conveyance, or quitclaim deed may be granted on, or made subject to, such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Transportation considers necessary to protect or advance the interests of the United States."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. STARK].

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support for the Kennedy-Pelosi-Stark amendment expressing congressional concern about plutonium production overseas.

With just a few pounds of plutonium, a rogue nation or a terrorist group can make a primitive, but extremely destructive atomic bomb. Yet Britain, France, Japan, and Russia are planning to produce many tons of this highly toxic, bomb material for their civilian nuclear program, even as the United States and Russia struggle to dispose of the plutonium from their nuclear weapons.

More than a decade ago, the United States wisely rejected the option of using plutonium in civilian power reactors. Since then, the economic rationale has only weakened, while North Korea has shown the hazards of this material in the hands of a rogue regime.

Recent articles in the *Economist* and *Foreign Affairs* have emphasized the proliferation risks of plutonium. In a July 10 editorial, *The New York Times* said "President Clinton would be prudent to make a global ban on production of fissile material a centerpiece of his nonproliferation policy."

This amendment urges Britain, France, Japan, and Russia not to start up or continue to operate plutonium reprocessing facilities until the outstanding proliferation and environmental concerns have been resolved. Britain especially is a concern, as the U.K. is scheduled to bring on line its thermal oxide reprocessing plant

[THORP] later this year or early next year. THORP would add 59 tons to the existing worldwide glut of plutonium over the next decade. The plant would also produce a tenfold increase in radioactive emissions into the Irish Sea. Once this plant begins operation and is irradiated, the costs of shut down increase dramatically.

The Irish Government has objected to the startup of THORP, citing the "additional and unnecessary risk to the health and safety of the Irish population." The United States should join Ireland in expressing concern about the environmental and proliferation risks associated with THORP. The U.K. is currently conducting an internal review on whether to startup THORP at all, given its poor economics and high cost of decommissioning. A U.S. expression of concern could tip the scales on this debate.

Let us send a strong message overseas—no more plutonium production, it's a threat to our national security. I urge support for the Kennedy-Pelosi-Stark amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, the United States has already suspended the production of military plutonium and abandoned civil reprocessing. With our amendment, we urge other nations like Russia, Japan, and France to follow this lead.

This message is particularly important for Britain, which will decide soon about start up of a plutonium reprocessing facility called THORP [Thermal Oxide Reprocessing Plant]. THORP could add 59 tons to plutonium stockpiles and further pollute the Irish Sea.

Mr. Chairman, there are hundreds of tons of plutonium stockpiled around the world. Only a small fraction is subject to strong international safeguards.

It is essential that the United States take the lead in ending production of any new plutonium, and in bringing down the current deadly stockpiles.

I will include in the RECORD a written statement and an editorial on the issue from the Boston Globe:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH P. KENNEDY II

The United States has suspended the production of military plutonium and abandoned civil reprocessing and commercial breeder reaction development. Our amendment expresses the sense of Congress that the start-up or operation of any plutonium separation plant abroad presents a potential national security threat and therefore should be suspended until all outstanding proliferation concerns have been resolved.

This message is particularly important for Britain, which will decide soon about start up of a plutonium reprocessing facility called THORP (Thermal Oxide Reprocessing Plant). THORP could add 59 tons to plutonium stockpiles and further pollute the Irish Sea.

Plutonium is one of the most highly toxic substances known to humanity. It can be

separated from uranium that has been used as nuclear fuel, and can be generated in breeder reactors. All grades of plutonium, whether called civil or military, can be used to make nuclear explosive devices.

A fifteen pound sphere of plutonium, about the size of a large grapefruit, is enough to make a small nuclear device. While the economic viability of plutonium has taken a dramatic downturn over the past decade, the world is awash in this lethal material. Experts estimate that at the end of 1990 there were 910 tons of plutonium stockpiled around the world. Only a small fraction is subject to international safeguards against proliferation. The dismantling of Russian and U.S. warheads will add to those stockpiles.

Continued plutonium separation in Russia, and reprocessing in the United Kingdom, France and Japan could put this deadly stockpile over 1,000 tons.

Plutonium generation by declared nuclear states undermines our vital interest in keeping other countries from developing this capacity. Growing stockpiles of plutonium, sometimes under uncertain control, pose an extraordinary risk that plutonium will be acquired by terrorists or rogue nations. The Department of Defense has stated its view that the proliferation risk posed by reprocessing and separated plutonium under international safeguards are unacceptably high.

Mr. Chairman, security for the United States, is more than just a matter of well-trained forces in uniform and effective weapons. As President Clinton, and Armed Services Chairman Dellums have often stressed, our security will be fundamentally effected by the success or failure of our non-proliferation efforts in the decades ahead.

The Clinton Administration is crafting a plan that calls for a worldwide ban on the production of materials for nuclear weapons. Initial reports suggest that the plan will focus on plutonium that is designated for military purposes. Through passage of this amendment we offer a strong signal of support to the Administration for a vigorous non-proliferation strategy, and would spur the Administration to go further, and seek the end of civil plutonium production as well.

I thank Chairman Dellums for including this amendment en bloc, and for his continued leadership against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

[From the Boston Globe, Aug. 5, 1993]

DOWN THE PLUTONIUM PATH

Congress has an opportunity to caution the major nuclear powers, including the United States, on a significant danger in the post-Cold War world by expressing opposition to the reprocessing of spent fuel from power plants to obtain plutonium.

In an amendment sponsored by Rep. Joseph P. Kennedy 2d to a broad bill, Congress would take the stand that continued operation of plutonium separation plants or the building of any new ones would be a threat to national security and should be suspended.

While such plants in Britain, France and Russia supply fuel for power plants, the disquieting fact is that the plutonium can also be used to make nuclear weapons. Opponents of the technology are especially concerned that even relatively small quantities of plutonium are enough to create powerful weapons—and might fall into hostile hands.

While those concerns may be exaggerated, there is a more important reason for exercising self-restraint in the separation of plutonium: reinforcement of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty, which constrains all

but the most reckless nations. The refusal by the United States and other countries to manufacture plutonium would enhance any countermeasures that might be taken against rogue governments suspected or known to have headed down the plutonium path.

From a pragmatic point of view, the temptation to use plutonium as a power plant fuel has been reduced by discovery that natural uranium supplies are more than adequate for existing and projected power plant demands for the foreseeable future. Uranium only slightly enriched with fissionable atoms cannot be used for weapons.

Suspension of plutonium separation makes sense. Congress can endorse the action in good conscience.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to briefly thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], for his willingness to work with this side of the aisle on amendments for the en bloc package. I would also like to recognize the help of my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK], for assisting me with my amendment to help alleviate the economic impact being caused by this administration's decision to shut down portions of the Savannah River site in South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1650

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me and for his fine work in bringing this bill to the floor.

I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the Kennedy-Pelosi-Stark amendment to express the sense of the Congress that no country should start up or continue to operate plutonium reprocessing facilities until the many outstanding proliferation and environmental concerns have been resolved.

As little as 11 pounds of plutonium is needed for the construction of an extremely destructive atomic bomb. Under the current plans for plutonium reprocessing facilities overseas, material will be produced by the ton that can be used by the pound in nuclear weapons. Production of this material must be limited. In 1988, the Department of Defense found that "opportunities for terrorists acts, including attempts to steal civil plutonium, will increase substantially as a result of the increased commercial use of plutonium." Such a threat highlights the need to limit and control weapons-grade nuclear material.

President Clinton may soon be considering a plan for a worldwide ban on the production of highly enriched uranium and plutonium. One option for this plan may be to ban the production of only nuclear material which is des-

ignated for military purposes. By supporting this amendment, Congress will send a strong signal to the administration and the international community that the production of additional plutonium for any use—whether civilian or military—has no place in today's world.

Our amendment is consistent with successful efforts by the Congress to support the principles of nonproliferation. Most recently, Congress played a significant role in influencing the administration on nuclear testing policy. I urge my colleagues to support the pursuit of a world free from nuclear threat. Vote for the Pelosi-Kennedy-Stark amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee for its cooperation in working to incorporate the amendment that I had offered into the en bloc amendment.

The amendment ensures that the provision enabling the Federal Government to provide a 70 percent share to small businesses in the various partnership and extension programs of title XIII of the bill are truly limited to small businesses.

The intent of the amendment is to prevent a defense contractor from taking on small businesses as minority interests in the partnerships in order to avoid the current 50 percent matching requirement. This amendment retains the 30 percent cost share for genuine small business applicants and ensures that this assistance is really going to small business by requiring a controlling equity interest in a partnership to be held by small businesses as opposed to entities which are not small business concerns.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. DANNER], author of an important amendment that we embrace in the en bloc amendments.

Ms. DANNER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to offer this amendment.

The amendment I offer today is the final step in eliminating an outdated and costly program that continues to exist.

The program, known as Safeguard C, was instituted in 1963 as a part of the Limited Test Ban Treaty and exists just in case the United States resumes atmospheric or other prohibited nuclear testing. The Departments of Energy and Defense are spending as much as \$30 million per year, on the admittedly negligible chance that we may decide to resurrect the practice of detonating nuclear bombs in the atmosphere, in the ocean, or above ground.

Earlier this summer, I offered a similar amendment which eliminated the Department of Energy's funds for Safe-

guard C. That amendment was adopted. I urge my colleagues to join me once again to cut this expensive dinosaur from defense spending.

This reduction will not affect the chemical weapon destruction facility which operates on the same South Pacific Island as Safeguard C.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the en bloc amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the en bloc amendment that was based on H.R. 2541. There were many veterans of the Persian Gulf war who have undiagnosed illnesses. The VA and the military medical communities have given these illnesses a catchall diagnosis. Through the VA, we have set up to give priority here to the Gulf war veterans. We now, in the Committee on Armed Services, seek to provide funds for a study of an environmental unit on the effects of multiple chemical sensitivity. We will continue our oversight responsibilities, and I support this en bloc amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUYER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] for yielding to me.

I want to acknowledge the tremendous contribution that he has made on this particular issue because of his own service in the Persian Gulf and the fact that while he was there he also has since felt the illnesses that so many of his fellow veterans faced in the Persian Gulf syndrome.

We want to acknowledge the work that he has done and say that we want to thank the Chairman for the fine efforts he has made on including this amendment in the en bloc amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Technology.

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], who is the distinguished chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Research and Technology, if she would just clarify the report language concerning the Navy MANTECH program.

The Navy has 5 centers of excellence that manage their defense critical technologies programs. One of these, the Center of Excellence for Composites Manufacturing Technology, is operated by the Great Lakes Composites Consortium in my district.

The Strategic Investment Plan for the Navy fiscal year Manufacturing Technology Program for fiscal year 1994 includes \$27.9 million for this center in fiscal year 1994. Is it the committee's intent that the Navy fund the important work of the center at that level?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, the Committee substantially increased overall Navy MANTECH funding for fiscal year 1994 to \$120 million. It is our intent that the Center of Excellence for Composites Manufacturing Technology be funded according to the Strategic Investment Plan for Navy Manufacturing Technology for fiscal year 1994.

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, I thank the gentlewoman for her answer.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the en bloc amendment.

Mr. Chairman, today I have introduced an amendment to H.R. 2401 which will provide needed assistance and protection to communities impacted by a military base closure or major realignment.

One of the lessons learned from past base closures is that once a base or installation has made the final list, or even before, much of its vital equipment or infrastructure begins to disappear out the gate. This can cause tremendous problems for the local community in trying to come up with a private reuse for the facilities. This compounds the already difficult economic adjustment the community faces from the loss of jobs.

For example, the removal or disposal of groundskeeping equipment has left some communities in the past with a new and urgent financial burden of acquiring the same equipment just to maintain and keep the grounds and facilities in proper maintenance. In other cases, the closing of an air base has seen the radar and runway lighting equipment removed, which renders the base's reuse as a commercial aviation facility much more expensive and difficult for the community.

There are many such examples which can be examined from the experiences of communities affected by past closures.

This was recognized as a problem by the current administration, and on July 2, 1993, Secretary of Defense Les Aspin issued a 5-point policy statement signaling needed changes in dealing with future base closings. Point 5 stated that "DoD will no longer automatically remove personal property out of a closing base. Effective immediately, the new policy will strongly emphasize the needs of the community."

While I was encouraged by this policy statement, it did not outline specifics and I was concerned that there were no Federal statutory provisions delegating the Secretary of Defense needed disposal authority for related personal property. That is why this amendment is needed.

This amendment requires that an inventory of related personal property be taken by the affected military service as soon as practicable

following the selection of a military base for closure or major realignment. Once that inventory is complete, the local base reuse development group, recognized by the Secretary of Defense as developing a base reuse plan, will be given a minimum of 12 months in which to decide whether or not to retain a portion or all of the listed personal property. It is possible that the community would be able to act much quicker than that. However, 12 months would seem to be a reasonable guaranteed minimum time period for the community to determine its needs.

For purposes of the statute, related personal property is defined generally as property which is an integral part of real property or specially designed for or adapted to the functional or productive capacity of the real property, and the removal of which would significantly diminish the economic value of the real property.

The statute also specifically identifies office furniture and equipment, machine tools and industrial production equipment, dormitory and food service equipment, airport operating equipment, and spare parts sufficient for 3 years of civilian use, as personal property covered under the statute.

The statute is also careful to exclude military unique items, such as military aircraft, vehicles, ships, weapons systems, and munitions. It also preserves the discretion of the Secretary generally to remove items that are urgently needed to support the national security interest associated with a specific mission of the Armed Forces. It is also not the intent of this statute, in the case of military supply depots and warehouses, that line-item storage and routine inventory be covered.

Personal property which is not selected by the community for retention is removed disposed of elsewhere within the Federal Government or to State and local governments according to existing Federal property disposal statutes.

Finally, my amendment grants the Secretary of Defense specific personal property disposal authority only in the case of closing military facilities, and allows the Secretary to accept consideration from the community not to exceed fair market value in exchange for the retained items.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment establishes a realistic, commonsense, and workable mechanism to assist local communities affected by traumatic military base closures. It gives proper recognition to the military's presence in their respective areas. It grants those communities specific rights and gives them a sense of stability to know that they can have a reasonable time in which to come up with the best reuse plan and not have to worry continually about vital equipment sneaking out the front gate.

If communities can rebound quicker from a base closing to a viable economic reuse of the property, everyone benefits. The community certainly benefits through continued employment and a new tax base. The Federal Government and the taxpayer benefit through the elimination of excess properties and the continuing overhead and maintenance costs associated with them. It will also make future base closings more palatable to affected communities.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has the endorsement of the National Association of In-

stallation Developers, which is a nonprofit organization which, for over two decades, has represented communities affected by base closures, and which represents many communities affected by the 1993 round of closures. I urge the adoption of this amendment today as part of the first group of en bloc amendments to H.R. 2401, the Defense Authorization Act of 1994.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN], for the purpose of entering into a colloquy.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee's efforts to assist those displaced because of downsizing and base closures.

I am particularly pleased with the committee's support for transition services to retrain workers and to assist businesses in employing them in new civilian positions. The statewide conversion networks you have identified will be invaluable in helping communities avert the disastrous consequences associated with job loss.

As the committee appropriately recognized, these networks will be most effective if they take advantage of the proven expertise of our Nation's community colleges.

In Jacksonville, there is a model of effective worker assessment, training and employability at Florida Community College at Jacksonville.

FCCJ has a great deal of experience in administering networks that have successfully provided training from entry level instruction to sophisticated skills enhancement to thousands of students and employees throughout the southeast.

Through the college's urban resource center, business has been able to assess the abilities of its employees and to upgrade their skills at the job site. This capability is a successful part of the college's overall effort to serve the needs of the business community and to increase the employability of the residents of its communities.

It has also been used as part of the college's overall effort to recognize the plight of the black male and the lack of participation of minorities in higher education.

The assessment and training assets of the college have also been successfully applied to the training of military personnel.

In 1991, the college was singled out to test the Army's teletraining network and was the first in the country to apply the use of video-audio teletraining to the delivery of MOS instruction to persons in the armed services in the Southeast.

The evaluation of the program was extremely positive and it shows great potential as a cost effective and proven method of assisting military and civilian personnel in their transition from

employment in the armed services to the private sector.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the Defense Technology Conversion Council to take advantage of the experience of Florida Community College at Jacksonville in its support of the development of networks for transition services, retraining and business development. It has proved its ability to serve as a national model for networks for transition services to separating military and civilian personnel.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her helpful comments. It sounds as though her community college deserves the attention of the Defense Technology Conversion Council as they begin to distribute conversion funds next year.

□ 1700

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. INSLEE] for purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, as the Chairman knows, I had proposed an amendment that would have authorized the President to withdraw American troops from countries that engage in unfair trading practices with the United States. At the urging of the Chairman and others, I have withdrawn this amendment with the understanding that the Chairman shares my belief that our national security is dependent on our economic security and that our economic security is threatened by countries that have unfair trading practices. It is inconsistent with our national security interests to protect countries which have unfair trading practices.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct that unfair trading practices threaten our economic security. We share many mutual goals with the allies in whose countries we station troops. One of those goals is free and fair trade. It is inconsistent with these goals for those countries to engage in unfair trading practices. The President does, indeed, have the authority to withdraw troops if he believes it is necessary and I appreciate the opportunity to highlight this important issue raised by my distinguished colleague from Washington.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I have included an amendment in today's en bloc amendments that would help communities deal with the severe economic disruption associated with base closures. The closure of Ki Sawyer Air Force Base in Michigan's Upper Penin-

sula could drive unemployment rates as high as 24 percent in the Marquette community. We must insure that Sawyer and communities like it have the tools necessary to cope with this difficult economic blow.

My amendment directs DOD to determine the feasibility of how not less than 10 percent of the projected 10 year cost savings resulting from the closure of a particular military base be returned directly to the community in which the base is located. It is only fair that the DOD target a reasonable amount of its cost savings to the communities that have supported military installations and are now being asked to bear the full burden of their loss.

I thank Chairman DELLUMS for his support of my amendment.

I also want to highlight provisions included in this en bloc amendment offered by Mr. HANSEN that would help communities retain important assets during base closures and realignments. During the last round of base closures many communities were hampered in their conversion efforts by premature removal of materials and property from installations scheduled for closure. Wurtsmith Air Force Base in Oscoda, MI, is a prime example. The record of the Air Combat Command and the Air Force Base Disposal Agency during the closure process at Wurtsmith has been disappointing. Community leaders around Wurtsmith, Michigan State officials, and Federal elected officials have spent enormous time just trying to hold the Air Force to its own commitments, including promises to retain key equipment on base during the closure process and to maintain certain properties intact. The property disposal restrictions in this amendment would make certain that communities affected by the 1993 round of closures have full access to the resources at the facility that are essential to its successful conversion.

Specifically, the amendment would require that an inventory be conducted of all property and equipment at a facility scheduled for closure, after which the recognized community redevelopment group will have a minimum of 1 year to decide whether or not to retain part or all of it. This would insure that communities get the first opportunity to purchase and retain any asset that would be helpful to their development efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the en bloc amendments.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire as to the amount of time remaining on this side of the aisle?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to thank Chairman DELLUMS and ranking member Mr. SPENCE for all of their work in putting together this legislation.

I had originally submitted a separate amendment that would have, in effect,

terminated the Air Force's F-16 program after fiscal year 1994. However, I am pleased that my amendment has been included in the chairman's en bloc amendment.

My amendment cancels F-16 advanced procurement funds for fiscal year 1995, thereby ceasing all future F-16 purchases by the U.S. Air Force. Meanwhile, it reallocates the previously authorized \$70.8 million for advanced procurement to help offset the costs of program termination. My colleagues, by terminating a program that has outlived its justification, we will save the American taxpayer more than three-quarters of a billion dollars every single year.

My provision is identical to action already taken by our colleagues in the other body. The Air Force currently has more F-16 aircraft than it needs to outfit its fighter squadrons. At the same time, Secretary of Defense Les Aspin's bottom-up review calls for a reduction of total aircraft wings from the current 28 down to 20, further reducing our need for these aircraft. Secretary Aspin concluded, as Secretary Cheney had before him, that the Air Force simply does not need any more F-16's. As a result, the bottom-up review supports termination of the F-16 program after fiscal year 1994—as called for by my amendment.

The F-16 is an excellent fighter aircraft—one that helped us win the cold war. But, the cold war is over now and the American taxpayers deserve their dividend. Help me save three-quarters of a billion dollars every year by supporting this important provision in the en bloc amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, it is important that the drawdown of our defense resources proceed rationally. We cannot forget those who will be displaced by the closure of military installations, nor can we diminish our defense industrial base.

I would like to clarify one point, however, with respect to the provision in the en bloc amendment entitled "Limitations on the removal or disposal of personal property and equipment in connection with the closure or major realignment of military installations."

As I understand the purpose of this amendment, it is to ensure that personal property integral to the functioning or productivity of the real property or essential to implementing a community base reuse plan is not arbitrarily removed. It is my understanding that

it is not the intent of this amendment to otherwise displace existing property reutilization procedures. It is my understanding that any efforts to use this amendment to circumvent established reutilization procedures would be contrary to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman if my understanding is correct.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that that is correct.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, my concern is that this amendment might be used to transfer or stockpile large quantities of heavy equipment—trucks, tractors, backhoes, and the like—without regard to fair and equitable distribution, as is required by existing law. We might get into a situation where large quantities of heavy equipment are at a base, and while any community could make use of that equipment, giving it all to one community would violate the principle of fair and equitable distribution. I do not think that would be allowed under the amendment.

I would further ask the gentleman from Utah if my understanding is correct.

Mr. HANSEN. Such actions would be contrary to this amendment.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would ask the chairman of the committee if he agrees that this amendment should not be used to transfer large quantities of heavy equipment without regard to fair and equitable distribution.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that I agree. I think such actions would be contrary to the intent of this amendment.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, my reading of this amendment agrees with that of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS]. This is a good amendment, and I ask the gentleman to support it.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, today the House considers an amendment which is part of the Chairman's en bloc amendment to H.R. 2401, the 1994 Defense authorization bill, which enjoys the strong support of the distinguished chairmen of both the House Armed Services and the Government Operations Committees, as well as the administration, and the State of California. First, I want to thank both Chairman DELLUMS and Chairman CONYERS for their unequivocal support for this important initiative. Without it, this endeavor would not be possible.

This amendment directs the Secretary of Defense to convey parcels of surplus real property at Fort Ord to the University of California [UC] and the California State University [CSU] for the purposes of establishing a uni-

versity campus and a multi-institutional center for science, technology, education, and policy. These two elements are the keys to fostering economic growth in our economically devastated region of the country. The proposed educational and research complex at the Fort Ord site is a resourceful paradigm that constitutes a tremendous opportunity to convert a taxpayer-built military institution into an entity that would serve the needs of taxpayers in another way, economically, and enjoys the strong support of the community, the State of California and President Clinton and his administration, as an exemplary base reuse model, one of six nationally recognized models.

The universities' initiatives to establish their new facilities at Fort Ord comprise the centerpiece of the Fort Ord reuse strategy. Without the transfer of the parcels, the base's successful reuse will be greatly delayed and the high hopes of the community endangered. Moreover, this legislation is specifically needed to overcome burdensome restrictions that education public benefit conveyances will not allow for, specifically, the ability for the universities to fund their development through private investment. Thus, this measure is critical to the successful reuse of Fort Ord. Without this legislative solution, the educational/science research project cannot become a reality. Enacting this measure will bring the local community a tremendous economic opportunity by converting the Fort Ord region into an area of higher education and research, focusing on marine, atmospheric, and environmental remediation studies; enabling it to attract private industry to form joint public/private partnerships with the governmental entities. Thus, I urge my colleagues in the House to support this legislative initiative.

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I support the block of amendments offered by the committee, which includes an amendment aimed at correcting certain problems with the C-17. I presume that the intent of the C-17 amendment is not to change the terms of existing contracts nor, in the case of software development, to impose unprecedented or impractical standards for defining completion.

I have been a supporter of the C-17 for many years, and had the opportunity recently to fly in one of the C-17 test aircraft at Edwards Air Force Base. I must say to my colleagues that I was impressed by the C-17's flight characteristics, by the equipment on the aircraft, and by the positive reviews of the pilots and load masters with whom I spoke.

Quite aside from my flight experience, I am even more convinced today about the need for the C-17's capabilities. Secretary Aspin's bottom-up review has just concluded that mobility is central to the win-win strategy articulated by the administration. The aging C-141, which the C-17 is intended to replace, has more serious corrosion problems than we anticipated even a few months ago. The need for the C-17 is not at issue.

The Congress has legitimate concerns, however, about performance and management issues associated with the C-17 development and production program. I share those concerns, and have been encouraged by the actions of the Department of Defense in undertaking a thorough, hard-nosed review of the

program. I am hopeful that the Pentagon review will be able to put the C-17's problems behind us. The committee recommendation on C-17 wisely protects this option without prejudging the outcome of the DoD review.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the committee position on the C-17.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the en bloc amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS]. This amendment includes a very important provision which the gentleman and I have worked on, concerning the removal of Russian and CIS troops from the independent Baltic States.

Two weeks ago, on August 31, the world witnessed a historic event, when the last Russian and CIS troops were removed from Lithuania. It was a historic day for all Lithuanians, and for the United States as well, since we never accepted the occupation of the Baltic States and always insisted that Russian troops be withdrawn from the Baltic countries.

Now the work continues, to complete the removal of Russian and CIS troops from Latvia and Estonia. Negotiated agreements, including timetables for troop removal, have still not been concluded between Russia, Latvia, and Estonia, and there are still between 20,000 and 25,000 Russian and CIS troops in Latvia and Estonia. The progress that has been made in the removal of Russian and CIS troops from the Baltics is in large measure a result of incentives provided by the Congress in foreign aid laws, and this provision will continue those incentives.

This provision will condition aid to Russia on a Presidential certification to Congress that:

First, further significant progress, since the President's certification to Congress on May 31, 1993, has been made on the removal of all Russian and CIS Armed Forces, including demobilized units, from the independent Baltic States; or, negotiated agreements between Russia and the Baltics have been completed, including timetables for troop removal; and

Second, Russia has undertaken good faith efforts, such as negotiations, to end other military practices that violate the sovereignty of the Baltics, including:

Artillery and similar armed forces training operations in the Baltics without the permission of the Baltic governments;

Interference in Baltic air space and territorial waters;

The introduction of additional forces in the Baltics without the permission of the Baltic governments; and

The imposition of economic blockades or interruptions of energy supplies.

This provision is the same as the amendment that I offered to the Foreign Assistance Authorization Act, which was included in the chairman's en bloc amendment, and passed in June. American taxpayers—who continue to face difficult economic times at home—should not be asked to provide economic aid to Russia if it continues to practice the cold war policies of its Soviet predecessor.

Exceptions for funds for food, clothing, medicine, and other humanitarian assistance, and for funds intended for housing assistance for Russian and CIS officers who are removed from the Baltics, are included in this provision. It also does not condition funds authorized in section 1204 of H.R. 2401 for the safe dismantling of the nuclear weapons of the former Soviet Union.

This provision leaves intact the exceptions to ineligibility contained in the FREEDOM Support Act, which allow funds to be furnished to Russia if the President:

First, determines that furnishing assistance is important to the national interest of the United States;

Second, determines that furnishing assistance will foster respect for internationally recognized human rights and the rule of law or the development of democratic institutions; or

Third, decides that furnishing assistance is necessary for the alleviation of suffering resulting from a natural or man-made disaster.

Russia has said that it needs to keep troops in Latvia and Estonia to protect ethnic Russian minorities. However, the State Department's 1993 human rights report finds no evidence of human rights abuses against ethnic Russians in the Baltics.

The United Nations Center on Human Rights, the CSCE High Commissioner for Human Rights and National Minorities, the experts of the Council of Europe, and the judges of the European Human Rights Court have all investigated Russia's claim against the Baltics and found no evidence of human rights violations against ethnic Russians in the Baltics.

No country has the right to station troops on the territory of another without that country's explicit permission, and Latvia and Estonia have repeatedly asked Russia to remove its troops. The Baltic countries are fragile democracies, and the continued presence and activity of Russian and CIS Armed Forces in Latvia and Estonia is a violation of these countries' internationally recognized sovereignty, a threat to Baltic political stability, and a barrier to social and economic reform.

Mr. Chairman, I support the en bloc amendment and urge my colleagues to support this provision.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I support the chairman's en bloc amendment which contains my amendment regarding the Impact Aid Program. I thank Chairman DELLUMS for including this provision in his package, and I commend him on his leadership this year as chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Section 373 of the underlying bill requires a study to determine whether the Department of Defense should continue supporting schools which serve military dependents under the Impact Aid Section 6 Program. My amendment would expand the scope of the study to examine the entire Impact Aid Program and how it affects military dependents, their schools, and their families.

Under current law, most schools which serve military dependents are funded under the regular Department of Education Impact Aid Program. However, 68 schools continue to participate in the Section 6 Program which provides direct Department of Defense reimbursement to schools on a contract basis for education provided to military dependents. While this program remains more costly on a per-pupil basis, it does, unlike the Department of Education Impact Aid Program in many cases, provide adequate and equitable compensation to local schools which serve military families.

The study currently required by section 373 was included in the bill by Members who believe that the Section 6 Program is too costly

to the military. They believe that the program ought to be terminated and schools returned to the regular Impact Aid Program.

I am extremely concerned about this new policy direction for several reasons. Most importantly, section 373 contemplates moving 68 schools to an underfunded program that does not work for most of the 2,600 schools and children who participate in it.

Mr. Chairman, we fund thousands of programs at the Federal level. Many of these programs address needs and problems that are properly the responsibility of States, local governments, or the private sector. We fund hundreds of billions of dollars of entitlements, some with little or no justification for Federal involvement. Among all of these Federal activities, impact aid stands out, in my opinion, as an absolute Federal responsibility and obligation. The military houses families on non-taxable Federal land. It then requires that local schools, which are funded primarily through local property taxes, pay to educate the children of these families. Without Federal assistance to pay for the cost of educating these military dependents, most school districts would simply go bankrupt in a short period of time.

I believe that section 373 raises serious questions about Congress' and the military's commitment to the quality of life of our service men and women and their families. The current Impact Aid Program does not work. Its funding formula is inequitable and the program is underfunded. Many schools that participate in the program are forced to compromise the quality of education they offer to both military dependents and community children.

I believe that section 373 ought to be amended to address the larger and more important questions raised by the military obligation to contribute to the education of military dependents. Do military dependents receive a lower quality of education because their schools must rely on annual impact aid appropriations? Is impact aid fair and equitable? Do schools that rely on impact aid experience severe financial difficulties because the program is underfunded? How do these financial difficulties affect military dependents? Does the Department of Defense have a responsibility to ensure a quality of life for service members, including high quality education for their children? Should the DOD take a greater, not lesser, role in ensuring a high quality of education for military dependents? How can the Impact Aid Program be reformed so that it serve rather than hinders local school districts?

My amendment would require the DoD to seriously address these important questions and do so in time to contribute to the reauthorization of the Impact Aid Program in 1994.

My own experience with the Impact Air Program in my district convinces me that the program ought to be entirely overhauled to provide adequate and equitable assistance to school districts in order to provide a quality education for both military and community children.

In North Chicago, following a decade of Federal underfunding of impact aid, local schools were forced to consolidate into a single mammoth district to spread the financial responsibility of educating thousands of chil-

dren from the Great Lakes Naval Training Center among as many local property tax payers as possible.

Despite these financial and administrative difficulties imposed by the Federal Government, the school district managed to survive for several years by cutting staff, faculty, wages, and programs. This year, the district was forced, owing to a multimillion dollar impact aid deficit, to petition for bankruptcy and further consolidation with five neighboring school districts. Despite a last minute bailout by the State, the school board tells us there is a very real possibility that the school will fail to meet its payroll sometime late this year or next. At that point, the school doors would be closed and children would be sent home for the year. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government simply should never allow this kind of situation to develop.

In a nearby school district in Highland Park, IL, following years of impact aid deficits, schools which once served Army dependents from Fort Sheridan and now serve Navy dependents from Great Lakes were forced to consolidate into one large district in order to spread the financial responsibility of educating military dependents. This school district, which is located in an urban, high wage, high tax area, provides a subsidy of several thousand dollars per pupil to the military dependents it educates. While the community has repeatedly agreed to raise its own taxes to subsidize the military dependents to ensure that all local children may continue to receive a high quality education, it cannot continue to do so forever.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Federal Government must accept its important obligation to pay for the education of military dependents. We must provide an equitable impact aid funding formula and we must provide the dollars to make school districts whole. We must give them the resources to provide the children of our service men and women the same quality education that nonservice-connected children receive in America.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment takes the first step toward that goal. It requires the Department of Defense to examine the Impact Aid Program to determine whether the program works for military dependents. It asks DOD to tell Congress whether the military has a responsibility to military families and whether it ought to play a greater role in ensuring a quality education for military dependents. And finally, my amendment asks the DOD, the organization that ought to have the greatest interest in the success of impact aid, how the program should be improved to better serve military dependents.

The impact aid system does not work. It restricts educational opportunities for many military dependents. It is throwing schools into financial chaos, and the problem is getting worse. My amendment begins the process of reforming the program to shift the focus from interagency squabbling and budget games to improving the welfare of military families.

I appreciate Chairman DELLUMS' willingness to include my amendment in his en bloc amendment. I commend it to you.

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the en bloc amendment and request permission to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment on humanitarian and civic assistance contained in the en

bloc is not self-explanatory, so let me outline what it does and why it does it.

Subsection (a) of this amendment would direct the Secretary of Defense to issue regulations no later than March 1, 1994, governing humanitarian and civic assistance activities. Legislation enacted in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987 and contained in section 401 of title 10, United States Code, states that such activities should be carried out under regulations prescribed by the Secretary. Almost 7 years have passed and those implementing regulations have yet to be issued.

A recent GAO investigation requested by the Armed Services Committee has uncovered questionable projects carried out under this rubric. The committee plans to await issuance of regulations, which could address these weaknesses, before acting further legislatively.

Among the problems is an overly broad definition used for the term "minimal" in subsection (b)(2), where the statute permits "the incurring of minimal expenditures" outside the bureaucratic impediments of the statute. The new regulations could address that problem. If that "minimal" problem continues, however, the committee will consider repealing this exemption.

The committee is also concerned that neither the Office of Global Affairs nor any other agency is adequately overseeing the conduct of civic action missions abroad. Some programs appear to be make-work projects that fail either to "promote * * * operational readiness skills" of the participating troops or to "serve the basic economic and social needs of the people"—two requirements of the statute. Some of the projects may even detract from the training the troops are supposed to be getting. Therefore, I hope the Secretary of Defense will energize oversight functions of his office with regard to this program.

The committee review of this program also noted that the Department of Defense general counsel, in an opinion dated December 7, 1989, opined that funds could be spent on humanitarian and civic assistance efforts in addition to those administered under section 401. This amendment includes language in subsection (b) that would overturn that opinion.

Subsection (c) of the amendment amends section 2551 of title 10, United States Code, to require the notification sent to the Congress concerning the transportation of humanitarian relief to include a description of all excess nonlethal defense supplies including the quantity, acquisition value, and value at the time of transportation of all excess equipment transferred.

The budget request contained \$48 million for transportation of humanitarian assistance supplies for fiscal year 1994 within the Global Cooperative Initiatives Program. Subsection (d) of this amendment authorizes \$48 million for programs covered by sections 401, 402 and 2551 of title 10, United States Code.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment would give the Secretary of Defense the clear statutory authority to transfer a small number of excess light aircraft to the volunteer rescue group, Brothers to the Rescue.

This nonprofit group is made up of volunteers who daily patrol the waters in their air-

planes seeking to save lives. The members of Brothers to the Rescue work with the U.S. Coast Guard in finding the location of distressed vessels as well as rafters fleeing Cuba.

They have been in operation since May 15, 1991. They have been on several hundred rescue missions and have saved over 700 lives.

The Brothers to the Rescue have an excellent working relationship with the Coast Guard. The pilots spot the rafts and radio the location to the Coast Guard. The pilots then circle the rafts until the Coast Guard arrives.

The Brothers help anyone in distress. At the request of the Coast Guard they transported a Haitian woman to Miami for medical attention.

The language of the amendment is permissive.

The aircraft sought are Vietnam era observation aircraft.

The unique nature of the Brothers' life-saving work does not fit into any existing statutory authority for surplus property transfer.

The Brothers have had to rely on rented aircraft to supplement their small fleet. While the organization takes care of its own aircraft, the pilots do not have direct control of maintenance for rental planes. They recently lost two aircraft and one Brothers pilot suffered severe damage to his spinal column.

Such authority to convey has been granted before by the Congress, most recently in an amendment to H.R. 4484 in the last session, which allowed the Secretary of Transportation to convey surplus ships to a civilian group.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, today, I am offering an amendment to H.R. 2401, the fiscal year 1994 Defense authorization bill. I believe that it is necessary to ensure that the Federal Government lives up to its responsibility to assist communities adversely impacted by the base closure and realignment process.

Everyone in this body understands the terrible economic dislocation which results from military base closure. Many of our bases are located in rural areas whose economies are largely dependent on the stimulus provided by the base.

I speak from firsthand experience in this matter. Loring Air Force Base, in the district which I represent in Northern Maine, is one of these bases. When Loring closes in September 1994, the local economy will lose \$70 million a year. This is about 25 percent of the economic activity in Aroostook County, a county larger than the State of Connecticut. The amendment that I offer today derives largely from the lessons learned by the communities in the Loring area as they prepare for the closure of the base.

The loss of Loring will be economically devastating and nearly 10,000 jobs will be at risk or simply lost. About 900 civilian and 3,000 military personnel are employed at the base, funneling more than \$130 million annually into the Maine economy. Another 6,000 civilian jobs are supported by the air base, generating a total of \$240 million annually in personal income.

I might also add, that this amendment is consistent with the new program announced in July by the administration to revitalize communities impacted by base closings. The administration and Congress both understand that the

Federal Government must do everything it can to assist workers and cushion communities through this wrenching period.

There are currently no laws or regulations which require the Department of Defense [DOD] to give preference to local contractors. Thus, DOD cannot legally give special consideration to businesses near a base selected for closure, even if the business is fully capable of performing the work at a competitive price.

DOD regulations, as well as the Small Business Act, do establish small business set-asides on certain jobs, but small businesses everywhere can apply for these contracts. There is nothing in DOD regulations that explicitly gives preference to local businesses on small business set-asides.

Base closure, or the impending closure of a base, is a traumatic experience for local economies and businesses. Communities that suddenly lose their economic lifeline need help to adjust and recover. Even with the very real asset of a military base, the job of nurturing and sustaining businesses is a difficult one for communities to undertake. The Federal Government has a responsibility to ease workers and cushion communities through this wrenching period.

The DOD recognized its responsibility to transition assistance for communities and workers. For example, its Office of Economic Adjustment has over 30 years' experience and a good record in helping communities cope with the loss of a military base.

However, since the implementation of the base closure process, the country has never had to deal before with the economic impact of base closings on such a scale. We need to do even more to help communities deal with these closures.

This local preference amendment is very reasonable. It involves only bases being closed or realigned. It is only fair that the Defense Department, to the greatest extent practicable, provide preference to local businesses as a way of lessening the economic burden of base closure. If local businesses are unable to do the work competently, or can only do so for an inordinate amount of money, then the DOD can find a different contractor elsewhere.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment. Thank you.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, some have said that a number of National Guard technicians already do not deploy with their units during times of need and that this amendment is truly designed to keep all civilian technicians from deploying at all. I would invite those opponents of this amendment who believe this to be true to tell it to Randy Eddy and Eric Sherry of the Wisconsin Army National Guard who, as technicians, were proud to deploy with their unit to the deserts of Saudi Arabia during Desert Storm.

On September 18, 1990, both these men as technicians employed with the 107th Maintenance Company were activated as part of the first Guard unit in Wisconsin to be called to duty during operation Desert Shield. On November 9, 1990, these two technicians deployed with their unit to Dharrain, Saudi Arabia and attached to the 593d Area Support Group.

There they were tasked with the inspection and, if necessary, repair of all vehicles arriving at Port King Abdul Aziz, assuring each was combat ready.

Because of their unit's success they remained in the theatre until July 3, 1991, longer than some active duty Army units.

Although their unit was the first to leave Wisconsin and the last to return home, these technicians did exceptional work. However, after they returned to civilian status and asked Congress to support various bills designed to improve the lot of all National Guard technicians, some Members have implied on this floor that they were unpatriotic.

These two technicians and all their counterparts took great offense at this. Randy and Eric served when called and served our country well. Indeed, they deserve our gratitude.

Mr. Chairman, there does not appear to be any good reason to treat National Guard civilian technicians less well than their counterparts in the Army and Air Force Reserves, and therefore I urge support of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, as the chief oversight committee of the House, we at Government Operations have been closely monitoring the progress of the Air Force's C-17 Airlifter Program. Over the past 2 years, I have presided at five hearings of our Legislation and National Security Subcommittee where we examined the financial and technical problems with the C-17. Together with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we have concluded that legislation is necessary to correct these problems.

This amendment requires the Department to undertake certain steps to correct three specific problems with the C-17 Airlifter—software noncompliance, wing defects, and a range/payload deficiency. With respect to each of the three problems, this amendment requires the Secretary to report to Congress on the status and cost of corrective measures. Existing C-17 contract terms control the rights and obligations of the Government and the contractor. Without adding or detracting from such rights, this amendment provides guidance to the Department to ensure that the problems are identified and that the Congress is informed of the progress in addressing them.

Of the three problems addressed in this amendment, software noncompliance has caused the most protracted development delays with the aircraft. As such, it justifies the imposition of a significant incentive for contractor performance by withholding from the unliquidated portion of the progress payments for noncomplying aircraft an amount not less than 1 percent of the total cost of such aircraft. The intent of this amendment is to provide a significant incentive by the withholding of 1 percent. The expectation is that this incentive will be sufficient to help speed the correction of the software noncompliance. Although this amendment preserves the Department's discretion to withhold a greater proportion of such payments, it is not anticipated that existing noncompliance would warrant withholding an amount greater than 2 percent of the unliquidated portion of the progress payments for noncomplying aircraft.

I would like to thank the ranking member of the Legislation and National Security Subcommittee, AL MCCANDLESS of California, and the ranking member of the standing committee, BILL CLINGER of Pennsylvania, for their bipartisan cooperation in this amendment. In ad-

dition, I am grateful to our colleagues on the Legislation and National Security Subcommittee—CARDISS COLLINS, GLENN ENGLISH, STEVE NEAL, CAROLYN MALONEY, TOM LANTOS, CORRINE BROWN, JON KYL, and DICK ZIMMER. Finally, I would like to thank Douglas Necessary and Steven Thompson of the Armed Services Committee staff, as well as Eric Thorson and Steven Vincze of the Government Operations Committee staff.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Procurement Subcommittee of the Committee on Small Business, it is my intention through this amendment to rectify an inequity that has been prolonged for too long due to a misinterpretation of current law. Through this amendment, I seek to clarify congressional intent with regards to the Small Business Competitiveness Demonstration Project (Title VII of Pub. L. 100-656), through which the Department of Defense was charged in an effort to study the effects of set asides on small businesses.

Unfortunately, one particular industry, military architectural and engineering services, which both the House and Senate Small Business Committees agree was never intended to be included in this program, continues to be penalized due to classification limits within the Small Business Administration.

I come before you today to provide a classification of this statute that reiterates existing law, enforces congressional intent and removes any misunderstanding that the SBA may have towards SIC Code 8711. Let me assure the committee that numerous efforts have been made by our committee to resolve this question with the SBA, with little success. It is our belief that the only way left is to specify our concerns through specific legislative language.

My staff has worked with the Senate Small Business Committee and the House Armed Services staff on the nature of this amendment. I am hopeful that its enactment will finally clear this continuing misunderstanding within the current regulations. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their support and urge my fellow members to support its passage.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support for the amendment to be offered en bloc to the fiscal year 1994 Defense authorization bill which would rename the Hanford Arid Lands Ecology Reserve in Richland, WA in honor of Dr. Richard Fitzner and Dr. Lester Eberhardt, two respected batlelle biologists who died in a plane crash on June 3, 1992 while conducting a wildlife survey on the Hanford Reservation.

With their work renowned throughout the region, Dr. Fitzner and Dr. Eberhardt dedicated their professional and personal lives to the dry lands ecology; its threatened and endangered plants and animals; and the thriving populations of other species contained within its boundaries.

In recognition of their highest of contributions made to the scientific community, I ask that the Congress honor the achievements of Dr. Fitzner and Dr. Eberhardt with passage of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, as the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Gov-

ernment Operations and a member of the Subcommittee on Legislation and National Security, I rise in support of a bipartisan amendment that is being considered en bloc and that concerns the C-17 Program. I am cosponsoring the amendment with the honorable chairman of the committee, Mr. CONYERS.

After extensive hearings on the progress of the C-17 program by our committee, two things have become clear—the C-17 program has experienced extensive technical and managerial weaknesses in the past, and our country urgently needs an enhanced airlift capability in the future. I join other Members in applauding the current efforts of Under Secretary John Deutch at the Department of Defense [DOD] to bring candor and accountability to the C-17 and other defense acquisition programs. Nevertheless, in light of the well-documented problems with the soft-ware, wings, and range/payload capabilities of the C-17, this amendment provides an appropriate level of increased Congressional oversight. The amendment is intended to encourage the expeditious correction of these problems and the enforcement of the rights and obligations under existing C-17 contracts. Through possible withholdings in the range of 1 to 2 percent of the total cost of the aircraft and through reports to Congress, we anticipate that DOD will successfully correct the C-17 problems of the past while allowing continued production and delivery without delay in the future.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by stating that this amendment is an example of how Congress can exercise its important constitutional responsibility of effective government oversight to the benefit of all Americans. Our citizens expect and deserve their government to meet our Nation's important defense needs with quality procurement, fiscal responsibility, and accountability at the highest levels. As this amendment shows, Congress can act in a bipartisan manner to produce effective legislation that keeps our defenses strong and fiscally responsible.

Let me emphasize that this amendment is the product of the careful, deliberative, and diligent efforts of Members and staff on both sides of the aisle. I wish to commend, in particular, Chairman CONYERS and his staff, Congressmen MCCANDLESS and HORN and their staffs, and Steve Thompson and Douglas Necessary of the House Armed Services Committee staff for their noteworthy efforts.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Conyers amendment to further unnecessarily delay, and restrict the C-17. The C-17 will play a key role in our post-cold war security policy and I strongly encourage support for this aircraft.

I support the C-17 for two important reasons: First, the United States needs a new, modern airlifter to supplement and replace the existing C-5 Galaxy, and C-141 Starlifter. We have a serious air mobility shortfall which, if not immediately addressed, could seriously hurt our key national security interests. The C-17 will successfully address this shortfall. Second, the \$41 billion C-17 program is an extremely important defense contract which provides thousands of quality jobs to southern California.

I recognize that our still-struggling economy and overwhelming budget deficit necessitates

a re-evaluation of our force structure—which means doing more with less, and relying more on systems that perform more than one task. However, with the resource constraints we face, we will need to make the most of our prior investments. I think the C-17 is a good example of the kind of sophisticated, dual-use, and forward-thinking technology we can put to use.

Our military and civilian defense leaders all agree that mobility will be increasingly important in the times ahead of us. Many fail to realize how the C-17 will increase our airlift capabilities. The C-17 is more capable than the C-5 or the C-141 because it has the transport capability of the huge C-5, but can land on runways that the C-5 cannot. Acquisition of this aircraft will give the Air Force an intra-theatre airlift capability that it does not have at this time. It would eliminate having to transfer equipment to aircraft that can land in smaller, unfinished runways—which are sometimes the only available runways in areas of conflict. This saves money, energy, and most of all, time. When our troops are deployed to danger areas, they must have the supplies they need to accomplish their mission. The C-17 can bring them what they need, when they need it, and does it faster and better than any other aircraft can. Some claim that the C-141 is adequate. The C-141 has been a fine aircraft—the workhorse of the airlift command for a quarter century. But like any good workhorse, it has reached a point where it should go out to pasture. Already, loads are restricted and some C-141s have even been pulled from service due to dangerous structural cracks. They're reaching the end of their service life. It is time for new technology, broadened capabilities, and greater efficiencies. It is time to modernize our fleet with the kind of airlift the military experts say they need like the C-17.

I realize that the C-17 has faced many challenges. Started in the early 1980's, it has suffered from the shortcomings of a fixed price development contract, and from the fits and starts of annual appropriations that have reduced funding every year. There is plenty of blame to go around for the program being over cost and behind schedule. I am not here to defend the C-17 development program, but rather, to focus the attention of the House on the product of that program—the C-17 aircraft itself. Jeopardizing the C-17 aircraft because of concerns about procurement mistakes of the past during the development phase is not responsible national security policy. What is past is past, and I know that there are lessons to be learned. However, we must play with the hand we've been dealt, and the trump card for airlift capabilities into the 21st century is the C-17. There are already numerous effective checks and milestones to meet before production continues. We should not be adding more.

Equally important is the \$41 billion defense contract that provides quality jobs to thousands of southern Californians. The C-17 is manufactured by McDonnell Douglas Aerospace of Long Beach, CA. California already has one of the highest unemployment rates in the Nation—over 10 percent. With the proposals for numerous base closings in California and the continued reduction in defense and aerospace spending, Californians simply can-

not afford to lose any more defense-related jobs. Further delays in cancellation of the C-17 would jeopardize the future of aircraft production in California. Continued production of this aircraft presents the Federal Government with a "win-win" situation—increased airlift capability for the Armed Forces, and more jobs for Californians.

Although many challenges lie ahead, significant progress is being made in testing and evaluation of the C-17's operational capabilities. I understand that the C-17 has flown over 500 sorties and 1860 cumulative hours of flight, averaging more flight test sorties per month than the C-141A, C-141B, C-5A, YC-15, B-1A, and B-1B. Over 100 percent of the 3509 cumulative test points planned for the C-17 have been accomplished as of August, 1993. I am told the C-17 has demonstrated most key flight and ground capabilities during test program and has set 14 world records for lifting payload to altitude. The plane, which depends heavily on electronics, including a fly by wire system, has successfully completed its electronic interference and lightning strike testing. The plane will have to operate in the extremes of heat and cold, and has successfully completed the hangar-based portion of this testing. Durability for first 30,000-hour lifetime started November 1992 and a test article has now exceeded 12,000 equivalent flight hours, almost one half a lifetime, on the way to two full lifetimes, by February 1995.

Over the past several months, I have heard my colleagues acknowledge the need for our Armed Forces to rely more on technology and less on personnel—to be smaller, yet more effective. Now is our opportunity to give them that technology. The C-17 can transport more supplies directly where they are needed, and does it quicker than any other aircraft in our inventory. I urge my colleagues to give our forces the ability to do more with less—to give them the technology that will deliver crucial equipment where it is needed, when it is needed, to ensure their success whenever they are sent into harms way. That technology is the C-17.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman DELLUMS for his willingness to work with me on an issue of great importance to thousands of people in South Carolina affected by the Department of Energy's sudden decision to close down portions of the Savannah River Site.

I would also like to thank my colleague from South Carolina, Mr. DERRICK, for his active support of these initiatives.

As a result of DOE's decision to close portions of the Savannah River Site complex, more than 2,600 people will lose their jobs. Consequently, the unemployment rate in Barnwell County is expected to reach almost 16 percent. While the figures are not available for Aiken County, they are expected to be approximately the same. The Spence-Derrick amendment will provide up to \$6 million in much needed economic and development assistance for the local communities impacted by these layoffs.

The amendment dictates that the Savannah River Site, as a defense nuclear facility, be treated in the same manner as DOD facilities. This would ensure equitable treatment of employees and communities affected by the clo-

sure or realignment of a defense nuclear facility. As such, the program proposed in the amendment is entirely consistent with section 1322 of our bill which addresses assistance programs for defense closures and realignments.

The amendment also provides \$4 million for the Savannah River Site lab, as a production site lab, to study critical technology transfer issues consistent with similar work being done by the national labs.

The Spence-Derrick amendment is a small but positive start in the right direction for all of those people who will find themselves out of work as a result of the Savannah River Site shutdown. I believe it is the least we can do for people and communities that have devoted themselves for decades to protecting the national security of the United States.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendments en bloc, as modified, offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

The amendments en bloc, as modified, were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 103-236.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SISISKY, AS MODIFIED

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SISISKY, as modified: The amendment as modified is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title X (page 329, after line 25), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1008. DEFENSE RESPONSE FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 3 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 127 the following new section:

"§ 127a. Expenses for response operations; Defense Response Fund

"(a) AUTHORITY TO USE RESPONSE FUND.—In any case in which the armed forces are used to carry out an operation described in subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense may provide funds for the cost of such operation, subject to the limitations in this section, from the Defense Response Fund. Such funds shall be available only for the incremental costs to the Department of Defense of carrying out such operation.

"(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—(1) There is established in the Treasury a fund to be known as the 'Defense Response Fund'. Amounts in the fund shall be available, subject to the limitations in this section, for transfer to the operation and maintenance and military personnel accounts of the Department of Defense.

"(2) Amounts appropriated to the fund shall remain available until expended.

"(3) Transfers from the fund shall not be charged against the maximum amount of transfer that may be made under any provision in an annual defense authorization or appropriations Act providing general authority for the transfer of funds among accounts and funds of the Department of Defense.

"(c) AUTHORIZED PURPOSES OF FUND.—Amounts in the fund may be used, at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, only in connection with an operation required of the Department of Defense by the President which is one of the following:

"(1) A foreign disaster relief operation.

"(2) A peacekeeping operation carried out under the auspices of the United Nations or another international organization.

"(3) A peace enforcement operation carried out under the auspices of the United Nations or another international organization.

"(4) An operation to provide support to domestic civil authority.

"(5) A noncombatant evacuation operation.

"(d) FINANCIAL PLAN FOR OPERATIONS EXPECTED TO EXHAUST FUND.—In the case of any operation for which funds are provided under this section which the Secretary of Defense determines may exhaust the balance in the fund, the Secretary shall promptly submit to Congress a financial plan for the operation that sets forth the manner by which it is proposed by the executive branch to obtain funds for the total incremental cost to the United States of the operation.

"(e) PROHIBITION AGAINST USE FOR ONGOING AND SMALL-SCALE OPERATIONS.—(1) Amounts in the fund are not available—

"(A) for ongoing operations (except as provided in paragraph (2)(B)); or

"(B) for small-scale operations.

"(2)(A) For purposes of this subsection, an ongoing operation is an operation that was underway while the budget of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year during which the operation is to be funded was being prepared for submission to Congress.

"(B) The prohibition in paragraph (1)(A) does not apply in the case of an ongoing operation that was expected (as of the time such budget was being prepared) to be completed by the beginning of the fiscal year for which such budget was prepared but which (for reasons that could not be anticipated at the time of such preparation) continued into that fiscal year.

"(3) For purposes of this subsection, a small-scale operation is one for which the total incremental cost to the Department of Defense is expected to be less than \$1,000,000.

"(f) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—Obligations for the incremental costs for any operation described in subsection (c) may not be made in excess of \$20,000,000 until the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress notification of the intention to make such obligations in excess of such amount and a period of 20 days has elapsed.

"(g) INCREMENTAL COSTS.—For purposes of this section, incremental costs of the Department of Defense with respect to an operation are the costs that are directly attributable to the operation and that are otherwise chargeable to accounts available for operation and maintenance or for military personnel. Any costs which are otherwise chargeable to accounts available for procurement may not be considered to be incremental costs for purposes of this section.

"(h) GAO AUDITS.—In addition to the financial statements and audits required by section 3515 and 3521 of title 31, United States Code, the Comptroller General of the United States shall from time to time carry out examinations of the fund to ensure that proper accounting procedures are followed and to determine whether the requirements and limitations in this section are being complied with."

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 127 the following new item:

"127a. Expenses for response operations; Defense Response Fund."

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994.—There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1994 to the Defense Response Fund established under section 127a of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), the sum of \$30,000,000.

(c) TRANSITION PROVISION.—In the case of any operation described in subsection (c) of section 127a of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), that is ongoing as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the limitation in subsection (e)(1)(A) of such section shall not apply with respect to expenditures during fiscal year 1994.

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, as modified, be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment, as modified.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY].

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. What we have here is a friendly disagreement between the Republicans and Democrats on the Armed Services Committee. Let me give the Members some background on the issue.

It may sound odd, but when we budget for the military, we really budget for peacetime operations, not for emergencies, even though the military exists for emergencies. So, whenever something happens around the world and the military actually has to do something, it has to scramble to find the funds to pay the bills. It ends up robbing Peter to pay Paul, canceling an exercise, halting a training program—all in order to free up money to pay for the gas needed to deploy.

Our subcommittee worked up language designed to fix that by allowing the startup costs of many unanticipated operations to be paid for on an interim basis from the resources of the defense business operations fund. This is a little financial sleight of hand that allows bills to be paid without putting any money up front. Both the Republican and Democratic leadership of the subcommittee felt this solved the problem.

Defense Secretary Aspin said this solved one of his problems but did nothing for another. His second problem is that the services are historically reluctant to take to the field, fearful that they will get stuck with the bill. Even with the mechanism we devised,

the services still could get stuck. Secretary Aspin asked for a cash account that could be tapped so the services would know they would be reimbursed. The Republicans on our committee said they didn't want to go that far.

Personally, I think both approaches are sound. You should have a cash account to start out with. If the emergency is so big that it drains the account, then you can use the second, noncash funding mechanism. With both the cash fund and the noncash mechanism, you've covered the waterfront.

Since both the Republicans and Democrats on the committee agree on the noncash mechanism, it has been included in the en bloc. Since we do not agree on the cash fund, that is coming up for a separate vote now.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is redundant, unnecessary, and takes us down an increasingly slippery path toward greater involvement in future Somalias.

This amendment is redundant and unnecessary because the House has already adopted a provision dealing with the issue of how best to fund contingency operations.

But more importantly, this amendment is ill-advised because it puts in place a mechanism to grant the Pentagon blank checks to pay for unspecified peacekeeping adventures throughout the world.

When you combine this with where this administration seems to be going in the area of peacekeeping, we should be very, very cautious about what new authorities and latitudes we grant.

This administration is on the verge of moving U.S. foreign policy interests in a direction where the United Nations will receive a large role in determining how and where we commit U.S. forces abroad.

The issue is no longer how U.S. interests apply, but rather how global multilateralism is served by the United States shouldering the burden of military peacekeeping operations.

I consider such a policy untenable and believe the House should reject any amendment or provision that encourages or supports this administration's shift toward greater and greater involvement in ill-defined peacekeeping operations.

□ 1710

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time for the purpose of a colloquy.

I would like to understand from my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, that the intention of his proposed section 1005 is to provide authorization for the expenditure of funds from the defense response fund for only such operations that have been authorized to be performed. This gentleman recognizes that we are in a dialog within our institution and with the other body, as well as with the administration, on precisely what actions are required to authorize the use of U.S. military force. It is my understanding that this section does not attempt to answer that debate; that is to say, that nothing in this proposed section may serve as a standing authorization for the use of force, simply that it would authorize funds to be used, up to the limits, for those uses of our military forces that have secured the required authorization. Is that correct?

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, yes, the chairman is correct. It is the intention of the author of this amendment that it is solely to authorize the use of financial resources for operations which have otherwise been authorized pursuant to our Constitution and laws governing the use of military force. It cannot and should not be read to create an authorization to use force by itself; it is simply an effort to provide an authorized source of funds for those times when the use of force is necessary and is undertaken consistently with our constitutional and statutory requirements.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, with that explanation, I am pleased to rise in support of the amendment and urge my colleagues to adopt the amendment.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the two amendments offered by Mr. SISISKY as part of the Defense Department's so-called global cooperation initiative. That initiative—and these amendments are an integral part of the Clinton administration's plan to significantly increase U.S. involvement in U.N. peacekeeping operations.

The Clinton administration has made the expansion of international peacekeeping a centerpiece of its foreign policy. Indeed, I do not think I exaggerate in saying that international peacekeeping is to this administration's foreign policy what health care reform is to its domestic policy.

But, in contrast to the months of internal review that the administration already has devoted to health care reform, and the many months of deliberation on health care that lie ahead of us here on Capitol Hill, we are being asked to approve the first elements of the administration's international peacekeeping policy with only 10 minutes of debate per amendment.

There have been no hearings on where we are going with international peacekeeping. When I wrote to the administration to ask that they publicly release their policy paper on international peacekeeping—the so-called PRD-13—in order that the Congress and the American people might publicly debate this important issue, I was politely told that the time is not yet ripe for such a debate. I offer my exchange of correspondence with the administration on this subject for the record.

Mr. Chairman, increased U.S. participation in international peacekeeping will take us down a perilous path. It may be a path that eventually we may have to travel, but we should not begin such a journey without more careful deliberation than we are giving it here today.

We need only look to the two international crisis of the hour—Somalia and Bosnia—to see some of the risks. In Somalia, we are bogged down enforcing a U.N. mandate that goes far beyond the mission for U.S. forces originally outlined by President Bush, a mandate that bears no relationship to any reasonable calculation of U.S. national interests.

In Bosnia, where our national interests are far more significant, we stand on the sidelines waiting for the United Nations to agree on a policy that will demonstrate to the Serbian aggressors that their aggression must stop. While the United Nations fiddles, Bosnia burns.

Some in Congress may be prepared to embark on adventures in international peacekeeping without careful deliberation and without even insisting that President Clinton lift the veil of secrecy that now conceals his policy from the American people. However, I am not.

In the weeks ahead, I intend to work with my colleagues to forge a policy on international peacekeeping that can command the support of the American people. I invite those Members who share my interest in this matter to join me in that effort. In the meantime, I urge the defeat of the Sisisky amendments.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, August 3, 1993.

HON. ANTHONY LAKE,
Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LAKE: I understand that the administration has been devoting considerable time and effort to examining the policy questions presented by the increasing number and scope of international peacekeeping operations. I commend the administration for its foresight in this regard, and hope to be able to work with you in forging a policy on peacekeeping that can command the support of the American people.

I think it inevitable that there will be an extensive public debate on this issue, both within the Committee on Foreign Affairs and elsewhere. To facilitate this debate, it would be useful for us to have an unclassified ver-

sion of the administration's policy on peacekeeping. Accordingly, I would appreciate your preparing and releasing unclassified versions of both Presidential Review Directive 13, regarding international peacekeeping operations, and the corresponding Presidential Decision Directive.

I recognize that it may be necessary for you to withhold some portions of the directives because of national security considerations. Nevertheless, I think it would serve both interest and ours to release those portions of the directives that are already unclassified or can be declassified.

Please contact Mr. Stephen Rademaker of my staff at 225-6735 if you have any questions about this request.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,
Ranking Republican Member.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, September 1, 1993.

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GILMAN: Thank you for your letter of August 3, 1993, requesting unclassified versions of the Presidential Review Directive on peacekeeping and the corresponding Presidential Decision Directive. Your support on this and other foreign policy issues will be very important to us in the days and months ahead.

As you know, the Administration's policy on peacekeeping matters is still under intensive interagency review. I understand that your staff has been briefed on the progress of this review by National Security Council staff.

It has not been the NSC's policy to release unclassified versions of classified presidential policy documents. But once the current review process is completed, and the President has signed a formal Decision Directive, we will be in a position to make a decision regarding your request.

In the meantime, however, I would, of course, be happy to arrange a briefing for you on the Administration's review of peacekeeping policy. As always, I greatly value your opinions and look forward to working with you on these issues.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY LAKE,
Assistant to President,
for National Security Affairs.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. A number of years ago, the late historian Barbara Tuchman in her work "The March of Folly," chronicled significant points in history in which great nations, despite all warnings to the contrary, pursued policies contrary to their own best self interest. I say to my colleague that it is easy to read history, difficult to live history, and the challenge is to successfully create history.

It is important that we do not yield and join the march identified by Mrs. Tuchman.

Mr. Clinton delights in relegating difficult foreign policy decisions to multilateral organizations. Passing difficult choices off to the United Nations has become a cornerstone of the Clinton foreign policy. The order,

counterorder and disorder resulting from this approach is evident in the administration's dealings from Bosnia to Somalia.

At the same time, we continue to make speedy and drastic cuts in our defense spending. For all its hype, the much vaunted Bottom-up Review has created a much smaller force that is supposed to accomplish the same missions as the Base Force through the mythical use of force enhancers.

With increased commitments and reduced forces, we are now asked to establish a startup fund for more ill-advised adventures to pressure our precious, and rapidly dwindling, defense assets.

This is one march I urge others not join. Resist the folly, vote no on this amendment.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This amendment and the one to follow are part of a broad-based policy which the Clinton administration seeks which will be proposed to subordinate U.S. forces to the United Nations or to multilateral command.

Let us look at the experience we have had in a similar situation in Somalia. When America sent troops to Somalia to restore order so humanitarian relief efforts could move forward, there was widespread support. Now there is little support for the international peacekeeping mission in Somalia. In that country under U.N. command our troops have worn out their welcome and have come under increased danger as the number of deadly incidents have increased.

I recently read in the New York Times on August 27 and I quote, "Mr. Aspin is expected to describe a policy framework for Somalia that could be used as a model for American involvement in other peacekeeping operations around the world."

Mr. Chairman, the United Nations has played a significant role in recent years, but it should be our ongoing policy where American troops are involved that we regularly subjugate our American role and our U.S. troops to the United Nations.

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself my remaining 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how this amendment got into all of this. It is absolutely amazing. A "Dear Colleague" was distributed saying that this amendment was part of a policy to dramatically increase U.S. involvement in peacekeeping operations around the world. I wish Members would read amendments first.

This amendment does not endorse, advance, restrict, halt an event, or otherwise impact on any policy. It simply provides a mechanism for paying for five very limited types of operations. I

would hope that this body would vote "yes."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY], as modified.

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 248, further proceedings on this amendment will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 103-236.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SISISKY

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SISISKY: Page 353, strike out the heading for title XII (lines 18-21) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

TITLE XII—POST-COLD WAR PROGRAMS

Subtitle A—Cooperative Threat Reduction with States of Former Soviet Union

Page 353, line 23, strike out "title" and insert in lieu thereof "subtitle".

Page 358, line 19, strike out "1208" and insert in lieu thereof "1216".

Page 362, redesignate section 1208 as section 1216, and insert after line 10 the following:

Subtitle B—New Post-Cold War Initiatives

SEC. 1211. REPORT ON SECTIONS 1212 AND 1213.

(a) PREPARATION OF REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall prepare, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, a report on the programs described in sections 1212 and 1213. The report shall include an overall plan for the activities to be carried out pursuant to such sections. The report shall discuss the extent to which the programs will be carried out using the authorities provided in this subtitle and authorities previously provided by law and the extent to which the enactment of additional statutory authorities will be requested.

(b) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit the report prepared pursuant to subsection (a) to the appropriate congressional committees.

SEC. 1212. PROMOTION OF DEMOCRACY PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a program to be known as the Promotion of Democracy Program. This program shall consist of military-to-military activities, defense contact activities, and comparable activities that are designed to assist the military forces of other countries in understanding the appropriate role of military forces in a democratic society.

(b) INELIGIBLE COUNTRIES.—The authority of subsection (a) may not be exercised with respect to a country that is ineligible to receive assistance under chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2347 and following; relating to international military education and training).

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than March 1 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall

submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report with respect to the Promotion of Democracy Program. Each report shall describe, on a country-by-country basis, the activities carried out under this section during the preceding fiscal year, planned for the current fiscal year, and proposed for the coming fiscal year. Each report shall also discuss the relationship between the activities carried out under this section and the international military education and training activities carried out under chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Promotion of Democracy Program under subsection (a) the amount of \$23,100,000 for fiscal year 1994.

(e) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations provided in subsection (d) may be obligated only after the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to the Congress the report described in section 1211.

(f) CONCURRENCE AND CONSULTATION.—Activities may be carried out under this section only pursuant to a program of assistance that is undertaken with the concurrence of the Secretary of State or at the direction of the President.

(g) CINC INITIATIVE FUND AMENDMENT.—Section 166a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (7); and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (7); and

(2) in subsection (e)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "\$15,000;" and inserting "\$15,000; and";

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking "subsection (b)(5); and" and inserting "subsection (b)(5);"; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (C).

SEC. 1213. PREPARATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING.

(a) TRAINING OF FOREIGN MILITARY PERSONNEL.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may carry out a program to provide training for personnel of military forces of foreign countries in programs and tactics relevant to international peacekeeping and peace enforcement activities.

(2) As part of such program, the Secretary may provide transportation of foreign military personnel to and from a training site. The Secretary may not provide reimbursement or other payment for subsistence expenses or other personnel costs of the foreign military personnel participating in the program.

(b) CENTERS FOR THE DIRECTION OF INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may carry out a program to assist the United Nations, at its headquarters in New York, and the headquarters of regional organizations to establish command, control, and communications centers for the direction of international peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations. Such assistance may include support for the organization, equipping, and staffing of such centers.

(2) This subsection does not provide authority to transfer title to any property, other than excess defense articles. Any equipment provided under this subsection, other than excess defense articles, shall be provided by loan (for a fixed or an indefinite period).

(3) Support provided under this subsection for the staffing of a center may be provided only in the case of United States military, civilian, or contract personnel.

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than March 1 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report with respect to the programs carried out under subsections (a) and (b). Each report shall describe the activities carried out during the preceding fiscal year, planned for the current fiscal year, and proposed for the coming fiscal year.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the programs authorized by subsections (a) and (b) the amount of \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1994.

(e) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations provided in subsection (d) may be obligated only after the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to the Congress the report described in section 1211.

(f) CONCURRENCE AND CONSULTATION.—Activities may be carried out under this section only pursuant to a program of assistance that is undertaken with the concurrence of the Secretary of State or at the direction of the President.

SEC. 1214. RELATION TO FOREIGN ASSISTANCE POLICIES.

To the maximum extent practicable, activities carried out under section 1212 or 1213 of this subtitle or section 401, 402, or 2551 of title 10, United States Code, shall be carried out consistent with the policies applicable to similar types of activities carried out under United States foreign assistance programs.

SEC. 1215. NOTICE TO CONGRESS.

During fiscal year 1994, not less than 15 days before obligating any funds made available with respect to any activity carried out under section 1212 or 1213 of this subtitle, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the proposed obligation. Each such report shall specify the activities and policy objectives under such sections for which the President plans to obligate such funds and the amounts of the planned obligations.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY].

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides a total of \$33 million for three new, post-cold-war programs.

No. 1, this amendment authorizes the Pentagon to help create a U.N. operations center—that is, a command, control and communications center that would allow the United Nations or other regional organization to stay on top of the many farflung peacekeeping operations.

No. 2, this amendment authorizes the Pentagon to train units from other countries in peacekeeping techniques. If country X says this battalion is delegated for U.N. peacekeeping duties, we would then be able to take the entire unit, from private to colonel, and run it through a rigorous training course, teaching such things as fire discipline. One concern is to make sure all such

units are working from the same set of operating rules so units don't trip one another up.

No. 3, this amendment authorizes military-to-military contacts around the world for the purpose of impressing upon foreign armed forces the appropriate role of the military in a democracy. We created such a program last year for the ex-Soviet nuclear powers: Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belarus. This amendment would expand the program worldwide.

These are programs Defense Secretary Aspin has an interest in. They were part of the very few amendments to the Cheney budget that the new administration submitted.

I recommend passage of this amendment by emphasizing one key point: All around the world, we are being urged to do this or that peacekeeping operation because no one else can do the job. This amendment will allow us to train others to do the job and help keep us out of peacekeeping operations.

□ 1720

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a key element in the Clinton administration approach to empower the United Nations at the expense of American interests and taxpayer dollars.

First, it proposes that the American taxpayer buy the United Nations a brand new war room for the bureaucrats in New York to run the many military "peacekeepings" being contemplated around the world.

Second, it proposes that the American taxpayer also foot the bill for the costs of training foreign military forces in the art of peacekeeping—something that I presume we will first learn how to do ourselves.

Last, it creates and funds an account within the Department of Defense for the new Assistant Secretary of Defense for Democratic Security and Human Rights, to teach foreign militaries their appropriate role within a democracy.

Mr. Chairman, every single one of the programs proposed by this amendment are foreign assistance programs.

They have no business being funded out of the defense budget and, in fact, are the reason that the State and Defense Departments have been at each other's throats for the past few months over who is in charge of peacekeeping programs within the executive branch.

With the drastic cuts this administration is imposing on the defense sector, the last thing we need is to dream up new, untried, and highly questionable programs to which to divert dwindling defense dollars.

Vote no on the Sisisky amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have not only great respect for the gentleman from Virginia, but great affection for one of the strongest pro-defense Members in the House.

But I feel in his words and in his body language that his heart is not in this, that he is carrying water for Mr. Aspin. And I smell Morton Halperin all over this odious task. The whole thing makes me uneasy.

We need hours and hours and hours of hearings on everything we are trying to do on this idea of peacekeeping. I thought our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California, Mr. DELLUMS, nailed down beautifully a few of the important aspects of the U.S. role in peacekeeping operations. But I think we need to remind the American people that we are living under an administration that is filled with draft dodgers and doves who never before wanted to see American force used anywhere. But if they can put our men and women in harm's way under a United Nations flag and establish a war room up on the East River in New York to have our men do the fighting and pay most of the United Nations' bills, then they are all for it. It makes them feel good. But I say no way, no way. Let us have indepth hearings. I urge a no vote on all of the Sisisky amendments, though I do so with a heavy heart because I truly respect the gentleman from Virginia.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is why I rise in strong opposition to amendment numbered 41 offered by Mr. SISISKY which would establish a \$30 million Defense Response Fund. I repeat this fund could be used to pay for the initial cost of various unplanned emergencies including so-called peacekeeping operations. I fear that what this fund may be used to start up may be extremely costly to end. During a time of drastically declining defense resources, we find ourselves entangled in the quagmire of Somalia where a mission of famine relief has turned into a clear-cut police action. We should heed the lessons of Somalia and not establish programs which could lead to future troop deployments without any end in sight.

I don't believe we should take steps that in effect would give a blank checkbook to the President or even the United Nations for committing U.S. forces overseas. Instead, we should carefully evaluate each situation and ask: What are American interests in the situation? What are the military objectives of the mission? Who is in command and who is directly responsible for U.S. troops? When and how will we determine the mission is complete and American soldiers can come home?

I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this measure and retain our responsibility for carefully reviewing the

circumstances under which U.S. forces will be deployed overseas. And may I insert at this point a letter that we sent to Mr. Clinton on this very subject.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, August 3, 1993.

HON. BILL CLINTON,
President, The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: With the House scheduled to begin consideration of the FY94 Defense Authorization bill this week, we wanted to express our strong concern and objections to a central element of your defense program—the so-called Global Cooperative Initiatives.

These programs, comprising almost half a billion dollars of the defense budget request, represent a disturbing trend to fund an increasing amount of foreign assistance and peacekeeping activities out of the defense budget function. Wholly apart from the merit of these programs, humanitarian assistance, foreign disaster relief, promotion of democracy, peacekeeping and related activities all belong in the foreign operations and State Department appropriations and not buried within a defense budget that is already enduring drastic reductions. While next year's allocation for these activities may appear modest in relation to the overall defense account, the impact over a five-year period to an already declining budget is likely to be significant and lead to a further erosion of military preparedness and capability.

Of particular concern with the Global Cooperative Initiatives program is the component requesting \$200 million to establish an earmarked contingency fund for peacekeeping operations. As you know, the defense budget is a peacetime budget designed to, as a general rule, only fund the equipping, training, and maintenance of a capable military force for the possibility of hostilities. By comparison, funding for actual military operations are not included in the annual budgets and have historically required congressional approval through reprogramming or supplemental budget requests. By seeking an earmarked peacekeeping fund, the Administration is asking Congress to prospectively approve the necessary funding resources to engage in unspecified and undetermined military operations. We consider this to be an alarming precedent that incrementally eats away at the constitutional prerogative of Congress to control the purse strings.

We understand that this package of initiatives has been the subject of intense debate within the Administration. Since the Congress has yet to receive a formal legislative proposal on this package, we strongly urge you to reconsider these ill-conceived proposals.

Sincerely,

Bob Michel, Dick Armey, _____,
_____, Newt Gingrich, Henry J. Hyde, Tom DeLay, Duncan Hunter.

Continuing, Mr. Chairman, I am also opposed to the amendments numbers 42 and 44 offered by Mr. SISISKY which would authorize over \$30 million in funding for U.S. military support of the U.N. and "Promotion of Democracy" programs.

We consider this amendment as reports surface of Presidential Decision Directive No. 13 [PDD-13], which would allow for the regular subordination of U.S. combat forces to U.N. or multinational command. Part of this amend-

ment would take a big step toward realizing the objective of PDD-13 by requiring the United States to set up military situation rooms at the U.N. headquarters in New York City.

We cannot afford to become the policemen of the world. Instead, we need to clearly define U.S. interests, clearly define U.S. military objectives, and keep U.S. troops under U.S. command and U.S. responsibility. We must heed the advice of our great battlefield commander, Matt Ridgway, who warned: "Except for valid security reasons, any action that cannot be satisfactorily explained to the troops, the Congress, and the general public, should be regarded as suspect and thoroughly examined."

I believe it is far too premature and far too dangerous to take the steps outlined in this amendment before we know exactly how far the President intends to go in using U.S. troops for U.N. objectives and placing U.S. troops under foreign command. So may I also put in the RECORD at this point yet another letter to the Commander in Chief signed by 20 of my colleagues. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
Washington, DC, August 26, 1993.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing about published reports that your administration is preparing a presidential executive order that would authorize the men and women of our nation's armed forces to serve under foreign commanders.

While we do not know the specific details of this executive order, any attempt to permit foreign command of U.S. armed forces causes us great concern. We are equally alarmed that, according to newspaper reports, the drafting of the executive order is nearly complete and it may be presented for your signature in early September.

We believe that submitting U.S. armed forces to foreign command raises many serious constitutional, military and international policy issues which, to date, have not been adequately debated.

We respectfully request that you cancel any plans to sign such an executive order and instruct officials of your administration to fully brief the U.S. Congress, upon its return in September, about possible administration proposals or policy changes regarding foreign command of U.S. servicemen. Such policy changes would have significant impact on our national security and should be thoroughly studied and debated by the U.S. Congress.

Your cooperation and assistance would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Senator Malcolm Wallop.
Representatives John T. Doolittle, Robert K. Dornan, Henry Hyde, Chris Cox, Cass Ballenger, Ed Royce, Duncan Hunter, James V. Hansen, Gerald Solomon, Sonny Montgomery, James M. Inhofe, Bob Livingston, Tom DeLay, Randy "Duke" Cunningham, Sam Johnson, Elton Gallegly, Richard Pombo, Jon Kyl, Chris Smith.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, earlier I quoted a philosopher, and now I will quote a Chinese philosopher.

Mr. Chairman, the great Chinese philosopher Sun Tzu wrote, "If not in the interests of the state, do not act. If you cannot succeed, do not use troops. If you are not in danger, do not fight."

This amendment is just another step toward Mr. Clinton's stated goal of placing U.S. troops under U.N. command to execute Mr. Bhutros-Ghali's international interventions.

The United Nations is not up to this task. Giving the United Nations more money for command and control equipment and a larger staff will not correct the problem. The multilateral approach can only work if the nations involved have a common political goal. We saw this approach work as the Allies defeated the Nazis in World War II, the U.N. forces held the line against communism in Korea, and the coalition defeated Saddam Hussein in the gulf.

This is different. With this amendment, we allow other nations to decide where and when our forces should intervene and under what circumstances. It is the worst of all possible worlds: It facilitates vague missions to be carried out with unclear political goals. Vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I also have great respect for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY] and the wisdom that he shows and reflects daily on our committee.

Let me just say that my friend and many other members of the committee talked recently about burden-sharing, about the idea that we should not spend as much money as we are presently spending to defend the world and particularly in Europe and Japan; that we are picking up bills with respect to national security that we should not be picking up.

I would suggest to my friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY], that under his amendment the Department of Defense and the U.S. taxpayers do pick up the costs of peacekeeping training for non-U.S. military forces at U.S. training facilities. And I think that this is precisely the type of expense under the idea of burden-sharing, of some equity being picked up by our allies; this is particularly and precisely the type of expense that our allies and other U.N. members should be picking up themselves.

When they come to the United States and they are availed of all of the facilities that we have at Fort Benning, at

our many military bases around the country, at places like Fort Bragg, where the Special Forces and Ranger units exist and they have the opportunity to be instructed by first-class, top-of-the-line instructors and people who know about high technology in the military, they are already using great resources that the taxpayers have given them. They should at least pick up some of the expenses in this. I think this is a good burden-sharing move for Members of this body to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I really appreciate these compliments that my colleagues from the other side of the aisle have given me, that I work with them on a daily basis to keep America strong, and I like them. But, you know, this is crazy. They are all blaming this on the Clinton administration. I thought it was the other President before this who started all of this.

You know, I hear it argued that these programs will increase our involvement in peacekeeping operations. These programs neither increase nor decrease our involvement. But gentlemen, if we do become involved, would you not like to know that the foreign unit next to us has been trained by us? If you oppose our participating in peacekeeping operations, you should also be in favor of this amendment.

Look, if we train foreign troops to be successful peacekeepers and we help the United Nations run a professional operations room, it is much less likely that we will ever be called on to join a peacekeeping operation. Look at Somalia: We went in there because the United Nations was not able to run such a big operation and because other countries were not skilled enough at the task. So, let us make the United Nations better able to run such operations, and let us train other countries in the skills needed to do the task. Think ahead; think ahead.

The sum of the opposition argument is that this amendment will suck the United States into all sorts of foreign peacekeeping operations. If you think that equipping the United Nations to manage peacekeeping operations for the first time and training other countries to handle the peacekeeping task will get our troops more involved, then vote "no." If you think that preparing the United Nations and other countries to do the job will make it less likely we will get involved, then vote "yes." It is as simple as that.

□ 1730

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore stated that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 248, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY] will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5, printed in House Report 103-236.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] rise?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BONIOR

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BONIOR: At the end of title X insert the following new section:

SEC. . NATIONAL GUARD CIVILIAN TECHNICIANS.

(a) INCLUSION WITHIN THE COMPETITIVE SERVICE.—Section 709(d) of title 32, United States Code, is amended by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: "A position authorized by this section is within the competitive service, as defined by section 2102 of title 5."

(b) APPEAL RIGHTS.—

(1) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 32, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 709 of title 32, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (e)—

(i) by striking paragraphs (3) through (6) and inserting the following:

"(3) a right of appeal which may exist with respect to clause (1) or (2) shall not extend beyond the adjutant general of the jurisdiction concerned."; and

(ii) by adding "and" after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (2); and

(B) by striking subsection (f) and by redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—Subchapter II of chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 7511(b) by striking paragraph (5) and by redesignating paragraphs (6) through (10) as paragraphs (5) through (9), respectively; and

(B) in section 7512 by striking "or" at the end of subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting ", or", and by adding after subparagraph (E) the following:

"(F) an action, affecting a technician described in section 709 of title 32, as to which subsection (e)(3) of such section applies."

(c) CLARIFICATION.—Section 709 of title 32, United States Code, as amended by subsection (b)(1)(B), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(h) Nothing in this section shall prevent the applicability of section 6130 of title 5 with respect to persons employed under this section."

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE; OTHER PROVISIONS.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section—

(A) shall take effect 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) shall apply in the case of any person who performs service under section 709 of title 32, United States Code, on or after the date as of which this section takes effect.

(2) TREATMENT OF PRIOR SERVICE.—Any period of service performed under section 709 of

title 32, United States Code (or a prior corresponding provision of law) before the effective date of this section shall be considered a period of service performed in a position within the competitive service for purposes of any determination relating to an individual's—

(A) tenure or status;

(B) order of retention in a reduction in force; or

(C) eligibility for coverage under subchapter I or II of chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code (relating to adverse actions).

(3) PRIOR APPOINTMENTS.—Nothing in this section, or in any amendment made by this section, shall affect the validity of any appointment to a position under section 709 of title 32, United States Code, made before the effective date of this section.

(4) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term "competitive service" has the meaning given such term by section 2102 of title 5, United States Code.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment on behalf of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] and myself. Our amendment is about one basic issue, and that is fairness.

Our amendment guarantees the National Guard civilian technicians have the same rights guaranteed to every other Civil Service employee, including Air Force and Army Reserve civilian technicians.

National Guard civilian technicians serve a critical role in our National Defense. They have waited far too long to have their basic rights restored. What the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] and I would like to do is to make sure my colleagues understand what this amendment does not do. It does not change the requirement that the National Guard civilian technicians maintain dual military and civilian status.

It does not diminish the State Adjutant General's military authority.

These technicians—and I repeat this—these technicians will continue to deploy with their units if activated.

It does not eliminate the requirements that the National Guard civilian technicians wear a uniform.

Our amendment will give the National Guard civilian technicians who worked hand in hand with the Army Reserve technicians during the Gulf War the same basic rights. It will give the National Guard civilian technicians the same rights that everyone else who earns a federal paycheck has. That right is to appeal adverse personnel actions to the Merit System Protection Board.

It will establish the same treatment for all civilian technicians with respect to personnel related matters.

It will eliminate the need for costly legal battles.

Mr. Chairman, it makes sense. It is sound legislation. It is long overdue. It is time we passed this amendment and give these brave men and women the rights they deserve.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The Bonior amendment takes away the rights of the State Governors and adjutants general to manage the National Guard military technicians in their States.

This amendment says that if a technician vacancy in your hometown armory becomes available, the job must be bid nationally on a competitive basis. This could prevent a local guardsman from getting the job while allowing a person from another State or even a thousand miles away to be selected because of civilian civil service regulations. Today, the adjutant general conducts a statewide competition to select the best guardsman for the position. This is done on a best qualified basis.

Let's face it, this amendment is being promoted to protect older technicians, but the problem is, it hurts young National Guard men and women who will not be able to get these jobs because they won't have Federal veterans preference or other Federal seniority. Most States have their own veterans and guardsman preference systems and we should honor this proven selection process.

The Defense Department on Friday issued a statement saying this amendment should be defeated and they said, the technician system now in place works well and should not be changed.

Under the bottom-up review, the Defense Department is giving the National Guard more responsibility in the immediate combat readiness area. So, we need young people coming into the system to fill combat technician positions and not someone who is overweight and can't pass the physical to go overseas.

Two years ago, this same small group of technicians tried to amend the DOD authorization bill to say that technicians would not have to wear military uniforms or even to be a member of the National Guard. The amendment was soundly defeated.

I am afraid if this amendment is adopted, it will be a foot in the door to try again to initially take away the requirement to wear the military uniform and ultimately to even be a member of the local Guard unit.

The whole issue of appeal rights has been exaggerated. There has been only one case in the last 5 years where a technician has gone to court to appeal a decision by the Governor and the adjutant general and the court did rule in the individual's favor in that case.

The Department of Defense says this amendment will reduce combat readiness. Now more than ever, we need to improve the combat readiness of National Guard units. The National Guard's Military Technician Program has functioned superbly for 25 years operating under the States' jurisdiction. This program has been so effective because it emphasizes the military requirements in selecting applicants for positions.

Today, our National Guard men and women are performing more roles with increasing responsibilities both at home and abroad.

I urge you to vote no on the Bonior amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

In essence, this amendment would extend the right of appeal for military technicians beyond the adjutant general of the State and outside of the military. Therefore, I must oppose it.

The amendment infringes on the constitutionality provided for the States to supervise the militia in terms of appointing officers and regulating training; but just as importantly, on a practical level the amendment would undermine the readiness of the Army and Air National Guard units by de-emphasizing the military nature of the technical programs.

Divided control over State and National Guard units and the personnel there would undermine the military chain of command and downgrade the readiness of National Guard units.

This, Mr. Chairman, is at a time when we are trying to improve their readiness because of an expected increase in reliance on the Guard.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is in the best interest of the individuals in the Guard and the Guard units to defeat this amendment.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

In America's workplace, we have an expectation that fairness and due care will be taken in situations where a person's livelihood may be threatened based on allegations of misconduct or poor performance.

For civilian technicians in our National Guard, the original 1968 Technicians Act recognized that these workers, like competitive service employees, should be protected from termination based on erroneous accusations. But that act unfortunately stopped

short of providing the technicians the same procedural remedies which protect all other competitive service employees from arbitrary and even capricious terminations.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment finally corrects that oversight by providing those procedural protections to civilian technicians. It includes the requirement that cause be proven by the employer at a post-termination evidentiary hearing before a neutral hearing officer who has been trained in the proper conduct of such procedures and who has the authority to award reinstatement if injustice has occurred.

This amendment relieves the State Adjutants General of the burden of final responsibility for procedural fairness in terminations. It assures those Adjutants General who make prompt decisions based on available information that, after any termination, a professional hearing examiner will be available to conduct a thorough inquiry and ensure that the government has not erred and, in so doing, lost a valuable employee.

I say to my colleagues this is a fair and practical measure that deserves our support. It finally gives our civilian technicians the confidence they have lacked in fair treatment regarding terminations and, I am convinced, that it also will greatly assist the Adjutants General in these employment decisions.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY].

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service which has jurisdiction over Mr. BONIOR's amendment, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by my good friend Mr. BONIOR.

This proposal, which has had no hearings or thoughtful consideration, is absolutely opposed by the National Guard and the Pentagon.

It raises profound constitutional and readiness considerations as to State National Guard administration of civilian technicians.

It deserves a hearing which I would have been glad to accommodate on the subcommittee on Civil Service if I had been asked.

The amendment would also make Guard technicians subject to the OPM reduction-in-force RIF regulations using seniority rather than performance review to determine who loses their jobs during a reduction in force. The amendment will also give civil service credit for the years a technician has been in the Guard.

Proponents argue civilian technicians have had many costly legal battles and should be allowed to appeal conduct-related adverse personnel actions to the Merit Systems Protection Board.

But really only a handful of cases have gone to the courts and there is much evidence that the current system is fair.

Concerns have been raised that this change will also enable out-of-State personnel to win jobs through bumping and retreating less senior in-State residents during a reduction in force, creating a lack of cohesion within the States' Guard structures.

For all these reasons and more, the National Guard is opposed. Vote "no" on the Bonior amendment.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, before I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, the distinguished chief deputy whip [Mr. LEWIS] I would like to point out that this question of job transfer from State to State is not the intention of this amendment at all. I would be delighted to work to close that problem if people have a concern about that.

I do not believe frankly that is a problem with this amendment, but if there is language to be offered in the future to rectify that, I am perfectly amenable to it.

What we are trying to do here is correct an inequity, to allow these technicians to have the same basic rights as Army Reserves and other Reserves who have the right to go to the Merit System Protection Board.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, for yielding this time to me.

I rise today in support of the Bonior-Gingrich amendment.

This amendment is about justice. It is about equality. It is about treating people fairly.

There are three branches of our military who have civilian technician programs—the Army Reserve, the Air Force Reserve and the National Guard.

National Guard technicians do not have the same rights as those in the Army Reserve. Or those in the Air Force Reserve.

You see, they do not have the same right to appeal their punishment. They must buy this right—with time, with money, with great effort.

The Bonior-Gingrich amendment gives National Guard technicians the right to appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board, a neutral Federal agency. Technicians in the Reserves already have this right.

My colleagues, it is time to ensure that National Guard technicians receive justice. That they are not denied equality.

The Bonior-Gingrich amendment will help ensure that all civilian technicians have these fundamental rights. I urge you to vote for the Bonior-Gingrich amendment.

□ 1740

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PICKETT].

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. I am very concerned that the amendment completely overlooks the fact that military technicians have always been employees of the State. They are administered, hired, and fired by purely State officials—the State Adjutants General. They carry out functions constitutionally reserved to the States.

Technicians were made nominal Federal employees by the National Guard Technicians Act of 1968 for the purpose of improving their pay and benefits by making them eligible for Federal pay scales and retirement and other benefits. The decision to make them nominal Federal employees was a device designed to skirt the constitutional issues that require the State to control all aspects of technician employment. The 1968 Technicians Act very specifically commented on the compromise nature of the law because it was quite clear to those who crafted the act that the States could not be denied the authority to employ and administer technicians.

If this amendment becomes law, the State Governors would suddenly find themselves having to respond to binding orders from a Federal administrative body dealing with issues that are explicitly reserved to the States by the Constitution. This is surely a burden that this body would reluctantly place on the Governors of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that any injustice that may exist in the system could be dealt with without challenging the Governors in this manner. I for one would welcome the opportunity to examine this issue more closely to determine the nature and scope of the problem.

At this moment, I ask my colleagues to vote no on the Bonior amendment.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PICKETT]. These individuals we are talking about here in their civilian jobs receive Federal paychecks. They work 9 to 5, and all they are asking is for that same right as their fellow technicians that they served with, in the Persian Gulf, the Army and Air Force Reserve technicians. All they are asking for is the same basic right to appeal grievances that are brought against them, and I would ask my colleagues to support the Bonior-Gingrich amendment. It seems to me that this is the fairest and best way to approach a

problem that we really should have tackled many, many years ago.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield those 30 seconds to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Forces and Personnel, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in opposition to this amendment. I have tried over a period of several days to work out an acceptable compromise that would achieve some positive results. However, Mr. Chairman, there is a small problem caused by the Constitution of the United States which states in part that the States have the right to reserve, and it has reserved the States respectively, the appointment of officers, the authority of training of the militia according to discipline prescribed by Congress, and, further, the National Guard Technicians Act of 1968 states that to recognize the military requirements and the State characteristics for National Guard by providing certain statutory administrative authority of the State level with respect to the technician program.

So, we see we have the Constitution, as well as the intent of the original 1968 act.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to focus the attention of my colleagues on the foundation document of our Nation, the U.S. Constitution. It confers on the Congress the power "To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the states respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress."

Mr. Chairman, it is clear to me that the Founding Fathers intended that the States retain extensive control over matters relating to the National Guard. The National Guard Technicians Act of 1968 was a carefully constructed compromise which balanced the interests of the individual technician with the military requirements and constitutional prerogatives of the States. One of the stated objectives in the report which accompanied the act was "To recognize the military requirements and State characteristics of the National Guard by providing for certain statutory administrative authority at the State level with respect to the technician program."

The courts have recognized and approved the compromise nature of the National Guard Technicians Act of 1968. The amendment in question would destroy the balance in the act and infringe on the constitutional rights of the States.

Mr. Chairman, the constitutional issue in this debate requires that this amendment be defeated. If there is evidence that the Adjutants General in the States are not managing military technicians in a fair and effective manner,

an argument that remains unproven in my view, I would suggest that such mismanagement be corrected with legislation that directly addresses the problems identified. In any event, the solution must remain within the direct control of the States.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the amendment offered by our colleague from Michigan.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. BONIOR, to make the National Guard civilian technicians part of the competitive service.

Earlier this year, I introduced a separate bill, H.R. 1234, to achieve this same goal, and I'm pleased that the Rules Committee has made this amendment in order.

Competitive service employees in other branches of Federal service have a host of protection available to them such as equal hiring practices, veterans preference in a reduction in force, protection from forced retirements, and the right to appeal conduct-related adverse personnel actions to the Merit Systems Protection Board.

National Guard civilian technicians should enjoy the same rights as all other civil service employees, and adoption of this amendment will correct a longstanding injustice.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, all time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 248, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 103-236.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUNTER: At the end of subtitle A of title III, insert the following new section:

SEC. 305. INCREASE IN FUNDING FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

(a) FUNDING INCREASE.—The amount provided in section 301(1) for operation and maintenance, Army, is hereby increased by \$100,000,000. The amount provided in section 301(2) for operation and maintenance, Navy, is hereby increased by \$100,000,000. The amount provided in section 301(4) for operation and maintenance, Air Force, is hereby increased by \$100,000,000.

(b) OFFSET.—The amount provided in section 1204 for so-called Nunn-Lugar activities is hereby reduced by \$300,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to just briefly tell my colleagues what this amendment does and reserve the balance of my time.

For those who are concerned about it because it does reduce the Nunn-Lugar dismantlement activity account, it does two things: It leaves Nunn-Lugar in great shape because we have authorized in the past some \$900 million for Nunn-Lugar for the dismantlement of nuclear systems in the former Soviet States. We have only used a few percent of that money, less than \$50 million. So, we have a lot of money left in that account. So, it leaves that account absolutely brimming with money. We have got almost \$800 million there, and it takes the request this year to an additional \$400 million down to \$100 million, which still leaves about \$900 million in the Nunn-Lugar armament nuclear system disarmament account.

Now what does it do with the money? It takes the money and lays it against our most critical and pressing military need, and that is readiness. Today, my colleagues, we have aircraft that are forgoing some of their important maintenance. The operations in Somalia are stretching the maintenance activity on marine vehicles. We have ships that need to be repaired where those repairs are being deferred because we do not have O&M money, and basically what we are starting to do is walk down this path towards a hollow military that we walked down in the late 1970's.

Mr. Chairman, readiness means saving American lives, and we can use this \$300 million for readiness.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], my distinguished colleague. First let me say to my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, that we have just received a letter today from the Department of Defense signed by Deputy Secretary of Defense William Perry in strong opposition to the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, and I lay it on the desk for those who are interested.

Second, Mr. Chairman, let me now give my colleagues a number of arguments specifically in opposition to this amendment and reasons for opposition to it.

First, Mr. Chairman, the delays in spending the money authorized reflect the efforts of both administrations to negotiate agreements that comply with

the congressional mandate and maximize the reduction of the threat in the four former Soviet States in which nuclear weapons are now located.

Second, spending has been delayed, for example, in Ukraine, where our negotiators have insisted on Ukrainian compliance with the pledges to eliminate nuclear weapons in Ukraine and accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty as a nonnuclear state. Secretary Aspin recently secured Ukrainian agreement to begin deactivating and dismantling ICBM's and hopes soon to announce Ukrainian/Russian agreement on storage of fissile materials from those weapons.

Third, many of the toughest negotiating jobs are being completed, and the administration anticipates much clearer sailing ahead.

Fourth, the committee has already added \$1.45 billion to the budget request to fund readiness enhancement, and does not believe that the additional \$300 million this amendment would add to the O&M accounts of the services is needed. The amendment, if passed, would leave only \$100 million in the authorization for Nunn-Lugar initiatives, a quarter of the administration's request. At a time when cooperation is necessary for the development and disarmament of the FSU, a reduction in funding for this program would be sending a message of "no confidence" to the FSU.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, elimination of most of the weapons of mass destruction of the former Soviet Union and the nonproliferation of the remainder of its arsenal is clearly in the United States national security interest. As Bob Strauss told the Armed Services Committee when he was Ambassador to the former Soviet Union, "We should not hesitate to spend a few hundred million dollars to destroy the weapons of the former Soviet Union that we spent \$4 to \$5 trillion to counter."

DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,

Washington, DC, September 13, 1993.

Hon. RONALD V. DELLUMS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the Secretary of Defense, I am writing to urge that the House of Representatives not approve the amendment to H.R. 2041 offered by Congressman Hunter to increase operations and maintenance for the Army, Navy, and Air Force by reducing from \$400 million to \$100 million the funds authorized for Nunn-Lugar programs in FY 1994.

The Administration's request for an additional \$400 million in DOD Nunn-Lugar funds for FY 1994 reflects the President's determination that continuation and expansion of the current program will be a critical element of the U.S. policy of cooperation and partnership with the new independent states of the former Soviet Union. To date, the DOD has notified Congress of proposed obligations totaling near \$700 million for specific Nunn-Lugar projects with the four eligible states—the Russian Federation, Belarus, Ukraine and Kazakhstan—for which the necessary agreements are signed or awaiting

signature or parliamentary ratification. If ongoing discussions with Ukraine and Kazakhstan prove successful, additional implementing agreements could be signed in the next few months that commit virtually the entire \$800 million authorized for Nunn-Lugar programs under current law. While we have encountered some delays in the past in actually obligating funds notified to Congress, these largely were due to difficulties within the recipient states' governments in finalizing the formal agreements necessary for the U.S. to begin the flow of assistance. We've made considerable progress on this score in recent months—in July and August alone, additional agreements worth a total of \$274 million were signed with the Russian Federation and Belarus—and, as a result, actual obligations and expenditures are beginning to increase rapidly.

Much remains to be done, however, to secure and accelerate the progress made toward denuclearization and nonproliferation in the new independent status. And even as we continue to insist that these states do their part and press our NATO allies and Japan to increase their assistance programs, requirements for additional U.S. assistance cannot be avoided or short-changed. If it were to become law, the proposed amendment would make it impossible for the U.S., for example, to meet additional and significant Russian assistance requirements to dismantle strategic offensive arms in accordance with the START II treaty and to advance the safe and environmentally-safe elimination of its chemical weapon arsenal. We also would be severely limited in our ability to help keep on track the difficult and politically-sensitive processes of denuclearization, demilitarization, and defense conversion in Belarus, Ukraine, and Kazakhstan.

By providing urgently needed assistance to the eligible states to facilitate the safe and secure transportation, storage, and elimination of thousands of the former Soviet Union's weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems, as well as strengthening safeguards against the proliferation of such weapons, the Nunn-Lugar program is making a unique and extremely cost-effective investment in our national security. Failure to make the needed investment now could mean that the U.S. will need to devote additional resources in the future—far beyond the proposed \$300 million “saving”—to deter or defend against such weapons and proliferation risks in the future. In short, the Nunn-Lugar program is not “foreign assistance” in the traditional mode, and thanks to the Administration's efforts, and particularly those within the DOD, to enhance the effectiveness of the program, Congress can be assured that the expanded program will remain as solid a contribution to U.S. security as any other \$400 million in the DOD budget.

For these reasons, I urge that the House of Representatives not approve the amendment proposed by Congressman Hunter.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. PERRY.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Armed Services opposes this amendment. The Nunn-Lugar Programs assist with the destruction and nonproliferation of the weapons of mass destruction of the former Soviet Union thus increasing both United States and global security.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1750

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY].

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to Mr. HUNTER's amendment. This amendment would redirect \$300 million appropriated to assist the former Soviet Union with programs that facilitate both the destruction and nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or so called Nunn-Lugar Programs. The funds would be redirected into the Services O&M or readiness accounts.

While I respect Mr. HUNTER's concern for the readiness of our Armed Forces, it is in the interest of our national security that the Nunn-Lugar initiative receive full funding. Every dollar we spend on this program is going toward both nuclear disarmament and stability in the former Soviet Union, and a safer world for us all. If this amendment passes, it would leave only \$100 million in the authorization for Nunn-Lugar initiatives, a quarter of the administration's request. At a time when cooperation is necessary for the development and nuclear disarmament of the former Soviet Union, a reduction in funding for this program would, in a sense, be a message of “no confidence” by this body.

This program not only facilitates our national security, but it is also integral for the internal security of the former Soviet Union. The Nunn-Lugar Programs lessen the number of nuclear weapons in the republics, and facilitates nonproliferation of these weapons. The global community does not need nuclear or chemical weapons available to the highest bidder.

While the need for improved readiness of our Armed Forces is a concern we all share, this need has been met in this authorization bill. As reported out of committee, the bill provides for readiness enhancements far beyond levels requested by the administration. The OPTEMPO accounts were increased by \$1.5 billion. This will allow our pilots to fly more hours, our ships to log more time at sea, and our tanks more hours days on the field. In addition to the increase in the OPTEMPO accounts, the committee increased funding for depot maintenance by \$765 million to ensure our military hardware is well maintained and ready. Reacting to the additional funding, the Department of Defense has advised the committee that any further funding above the House authorization could not be executed.

We should not compromise the Nunn-Lugar Program in order to provide additional funds for readiness. In a real sense, Nunn-Lugar funding contributes to readiness in that it neutralizes weapons our troops would otherwise face in the battlefield.

I urge my colleagues to consider the possible ramifications if a majority of the funding for this program were to be redirected. Support for this amendment would be compromising both our national security and the security of the former Soviet Union.

More important, this amendment would send a bad signal to our current and potential adversaries that the United States is not serious about reducing the potential for proliferation of these weapons. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the

distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], who chairs the Nuclear Panel of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Hunter amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Nunn-Lugar Programs are a brilliant and bipartisan creation of the U.S. Congress. They are designed, at very low cost, to destroy the weapons of mass destruction of the former Soviet Union. They are the vehicle for taking advantage of the opportunity we have to get rid of the missiles, launchers, and warheads that have held generations of Americans hostage and have cost those same generations a great deal of money spent in our Nation's defense.

Mr. Chairman, here is a summary of progress to date in implementing Nunn-Lugar. The Congress has authorized a total of \$800 million to these programs for fiscal year 1992 and 1993, of that amount, \$688.54 million—almost 90 percent of the amount authorized—has been notified to the Congress with the intention to obligate. Furthermore, this total does not include the \$175 million that Presidents Bush and Clinton have pledged to destroy the missiles and launchers currently located in Ukraine.

Let me add, Mr. Chairman, that as of today, almost \$53 million of this amount has actually been obligated in contracts for implementing Nunn-Lugar Programs, and an additional contract scheduled for signature later this week will bring that total to almost \$86 million. Furthermore, there are high quality American jobs at stake here—most of these obligated funds have gone to the United States private sector, with much of the remainder going to our Government facilities like our national labs. These are the people that will be performing many of the high-tech jobs in destroying the weapons of the former Soviet Union.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would not only cut three-quarters of the funds requested by the administration and provided in the committee bill for these vital programs, it would move the money to accounts where the committee bill has already added \$1.45 billion above the amount requested.

Mr. Chairman, it makes eminent sense to spend a few hundred million dollars to get rid of the Soviet weapons that we spent \$4 to \$5 trillion counter-ing over the last 45 years.

I encourage my colleagues to vote no on the Hunter amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first, it has been stated that the Nunn-Lugar Program is essential to American security. Everyone on this side of the aisle agrees. There is no more pressing challenge, nor important job for the United States, than to

participate in a program, and we really developed the program, to dismantle nuclear weapons that are aimed at us.

The point that we are making is that we have a large pot of money, almost \$900 million if this amendment passes, that has not been used. It is sitting there. And so far, under this pressing program, we have only used so far \$31 million, less than 4 percent of what is available.

Now, it has been stated by my distinguished colleagues that the administration thinks we can spend this money. Our answer is, let us get on with it. Let us do it. We want to do it. But right now we have a large amount of money simply sitting there. One problem is, this is somewhat complicated by the fact that instead of one Soviet Union, you have four former Soviet States, and the dealings with them are somewhat complicated. It is going to take some time to spend this money.

Now, at the same time, what do we have? Well, we have got a military that is being stretched by the up tempo around the world with respect to Somalia, the Guantanamo Bay operations, Northern Iraq, the former Yugoslavia, all the operations that we are taking part in right now are stretching O&M and stretching readiness.

We have deferred maintenance on trucks, on ships, on aircraft, and we need to get on with it. We need to have readiness.

The most important service that we can do to our young men and women that wear our uniforms is to keep them well-equipped. This does absolutely no damage to Nunn-Lugar. In fact, it might wake a few people up, and they might get on and say hey, let us spend this money.

So far we have only spent \$31 million out of almost \$800 million that is available. We have a very large pot of money available right now for Nunn-Lugar. And what we are really going to do, if we do not spend this money on readiness, is allow readiness to slip, and essentially simply cut the defense budget, because this \$800 million is not going to be used in the near future.

So I would ask my colleagues, vote for the people that wear our uniform around the world, who need ammunition, who need spare parts, who need to have equipment that is ready and works. Vote for readiness. Vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the House Resolution 248, further proceedings on the amendment of-

ferred by the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 248, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: Amendment No. 1, offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY]; amendment No. 2, offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY]; amendment No. 5, offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH]; and amendment No. 6, offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SISISKY AS MODIFIED

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY], as modified.

The Clerk designated the amendment as modified.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 248, the Chair may conduct subsequent votes in this series as 5-minute votes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 211, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 426]

AYES—199

Abercrombie	Danner	Hastings
Andrews (ME)	Darden	Hayes
Bacchus (FL)	de la Garza	Hefner
Baessler	DeLauro	Hilliard
Barca	Dellums	Hinchey
Barcia	Derrick	Hoagland
Barlow	Dicks	Hochbrueckner
Becerra	Dingell	Holden
Beilenson	Dixon	Hoyer
Berman	Dooley	Jefferson
Bevill	Durbin	Johnson (GA)
Bilbray	Edwards (CA)	Johnson, E.B.
Bishop	Edwards (TX)	Johnston
Blackwell	Engel	Kaptur
Bonior	English (AZ)	Kennedy
Borski	English (OK)	Kennelly
Boucher	Evans	Kildee
Brewster	Faleomavaega	Klein
Brooks	(AS)	Klink
Browder	Fazio	Kopetski
Brown (CA)	Fields (LA)	Kreidler
Brown (FL)	Flake	LaFalce
Brown (OH)	Foglietta	Lancaster
Bryant	Ford (MI)	Lantos
Byrne	Ford (TN)	LaRocco
Carr	Frank (MA)	Laughlin
Clay	Gedjenson	Leach
Clayton	Gephardt	Levin
Clyburn	Geren	Lewis (GA)
Coleman	Gibbons	Lloyd
Collins (IL)	Gonzalez	Mann
Collins (MI)	Hall (OH)	Manton
Condit	Hall (TX)	Markey
Coppersmith	Hamburg	Martinez
Coyne	Hamilton	Matsui
Cramer	Harman	Mazzoli

McCloskey	Price (NC)
McCurdy	Rangel
McDermott	Reed
McHale	Reynolds
McKinney	Richardson
McNulty	Roemer
Meehan	Rostenkowski
Meek	Rowland
Mfume	Roybal-Allard
Mineta	Rush
Minge	Sabo
Mink	Sanders
Moakley	Sangmeister
Mollohan	Sarpalius
Montgomery	Sawyer
Moran	Schenk
Murtha	Schroeder
Nadler	Schumer
Natcher	Scott
Norton (DC)	Serrano
Oberstar	Sharp
Obey	Sisisky
Oliver	Skaggs
Ortiz	Skelton
Parker	Slaughter
Pastor	Smith (IA)
Payne (NJ)	Spratt
Payne (VA)	Stark
Pelosi	Stenholm
Penny	Stokes
Pickett	Strickland

NOES—211

Allard	Fingerhut	Machtley
Andrews (NJ)	Fish	Maloney
Applegate	Fowler	Manzullo
Archer	Franks (CT)	Margolles
Armey	Franks (NJ)	Mezvinsky
Bacchus (AL)	Furse	McCandless
Baker (CA)	Gallegly	McCollum
Baker (LA)	Gallo	McCrery
Ballenger	Gekas	McDade
Barrett (NE)	Gilchrest	McHugh
Barrett (WI)	Gillmor	McInnis
Bartlett	Gillman	McKeon
Barton	Gingrich	McMillan
Bateman	Glickman	Menendez
Bentley	Goodlatte	Meyers
Bereuter	Goodling	Mica
Bilirakis	Gordon	Michel
Bliley	Goss	Miller (FL)
Blute	Grams	Molinar
Boehlert	Grandy	Moorhead
Boehner	Greenwood	Morella
Bonilla	Gunderson	Murphy
Bunning	Hancock	Myers
Burton	Hansen	Neal (NC)
Buyer	Hastert	Nussle
Callahan	Hefley	Orton
Calvert	Hergert	Oxley
Camp	Hobson	Packard
Canady	Hoekstra	Pallone
Cantwell	Horn	Paxon
Cardin	Houghton	Peterson (FL)
Castle	Huffington	Peterson (MN)
Chapman	Hughes	Petri
Clement	Hunter	Pombo
Clinger	Hutchinson	Pomeroy
Coble	Hutto	Portman
Collins (GA)	Hyde	Poshah
Combest	Inglis	Pryce (OH)
Cooper	Inhofe	Quillen
Costello	Inslee	Quinn
Cox	Istook	Rahall
Crane	Jacobs	Ramstad
Crapo	Johnson (CT)	Ravenel
Cunningham	Johnson (SD)	Regula
Deal	Johnson, Sam	Roberts
DeFazio	Kanjorski	Rogers
DeLay	Kasich	Rohrabacher
Deutsch	Kim	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	King	Roth
Dickey	Klug	Roukema
Doolittle	Knollenberg	Royce
Dornan	Kolbe	Santorum
Dreier	Kyl	Saxton
Duncan	Lambert	Schaefer
Dunn	Lazio	Schiff
Emerson	Levy	Sensenbrenner
Eshoo	Lewis (CA)	Shaw
Everett	Lewis (FL)	Shays
Ewing	Lightfoot	Shepherd
Fawell	Linder	Skeen
Fields (TX)	Livingston	Slattery
Filner	Long	Smith (MI)

Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist

Talent
Taubin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thurman
Torkildsen
Upton
Valentine

Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Williams
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff

[Roll No. 427]

AYES—199

Abercrombie
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Bacchus (FL)
Barca
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Darden
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
Evans
Faleomavaega
(AS)
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson

Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Grandy
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Hoyer
Hutto
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lloyd
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Mfume
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Montgomery
Moran
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz

Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Santagostino
Sarpalio
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Siskisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tajeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Toriocelli
Traficant
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Houghton
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingalls
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kim
King
Klein
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lambert
Lazio
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot

Linder
Livingston
Long
Machley
Manzullo
Margolies
Mezvinsky
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Menendez
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinaro
Mollohan
Moorhead
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nussle
Obey
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Roberts
Rogers

Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Skeen
Slatery
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Talent
Taubin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Torkildsen
Tucker
Valentine
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Williams
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—28

Ackerman
Andrews (TX)
Conyers
de Lugo (VI)
Farr
Frost
Green
Gutierrez
Hoke
Kingston

Klecza
Lehman
Lipinski
Lowey
Miller (CA)
Neal (MA)
Owens
Pickle
Porter
Ridge
Romero-Barcelo
(PR)
Rose
Shuster
Thomas (WY)
Towns
Washington
Young (AK)
Zimmer

□ 1821

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Klecza for, with Mr. Kingston against.

Messrs. HUTTO, TAUZIN, and DEUTCH, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. PARKER, McDERMOTT, MOAKLEY, SABO, and HALL of Texas changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). Pending before the Committee for the remainder of the evening are three amendments. They are as follows: Amendment No. 2 offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY], relating to post-cold war programs; amendment No. 5 offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], on National Guard civil technicians; and amendment No. 6 offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], on increased funds for O&M.

It is the decision of the Chair that rollcall votes, if ordered, on any of these remaining amendments will be reduced to 5 minutes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SISISKY

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY] for a recorded vote on which further proceedings were postponed.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. Sisisky.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 210, not voting 29, as follows:

Allard
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Billakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehert
Boehner
Bonilla
Brown (OH)
Bunning

NOES—210

Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chapman
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeLay
Derrick
Dickey

Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fingerhut
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor

NOT VOTING—29

Ackerman
Andrews (TX)
Conyers
de Lugo (VI)
Farr
Frost
Green
Gutierrez
Hoke
Kingston

Klecza
Lehman
Lipinski
Lowey
Miller (CA)
Neal (MA)
Owens
Peterson (MN)
Pickle
Porter

Ridge
Romero-Barcelo
(PR)
Rose
Shuster
Thomas (WY)
Towns
Washington
Young (AK)
Zimmer

□ 1830

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Klecza for, with Mr. Porter against.

Mr. WILSON changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1830

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BONIOR

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for a recorded vote on which further proceedings were postponed.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. BONIOR.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were ayes 156, noes 256, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 428]		
AYES—156		
Abercrombie	Ford (TN)	Pastor
Andrews (ME)	Frank (MA)	Payne (NJ)
Bachus (AL)	Franks (NJ)	Pelosi
Barca	Furse	Penny
Barcia	Gedjenson	Peterson (MN)
Barrett (WI)	Gekas	Petri
Becerra	Gephardt	Quillen
Beilenson	Gingrich	Rangel
Berman	Glickman	Reed
Bevill	Gonzalez	Reynolds
Bilbray	Greenwood	Rostenkowski
Bishop	Gunderson	Rowland
Blackwell	Hamburg	Roybal-Allard
Bonior	Hamilton	Rush
Brown (CA)	Harman	Sanders
Brown (FL)	Hastings	Sawyer
Brown (OH)	Hilliard	Schenk
Bryant	Hinchey	Schroeder
Cantwell	Hoagland	Schumer
Clay	Holden	Scott
Clayton	Horn	Sensenbrenner
Clinger	Hoyer	Serrano
Collins (GA)	Inslee	Sharp
Collins (IL)	Jacobs	Shepherd
Collins (MI)	Johnson (GA)	Slaterry
Coppersmith	Johnson (SD)	Stark
Coyne	Johnston	Stokes
Darden	Kildee	Strickland
Deal	Klein	Studds
DeFazio	Klug	Stupak
DeLauro	Kopetski	Swett
Dellums	Kreidler	Swift
Deutsch	LaFalce	Talent
Diaz-Balart	Lantos	Torres
Dicks	Levin	Torricelli
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Tucker
Dixon	Long	Unsoeld
Dooley	Machtley	Velazquez
Dunn	Martinez	Vento
Durbin	Matsui	Volkmer
Edwards (CA)	McHale	Walker
Emerson	McHugh	Walsh
Engel	McKinney	Waters
English (AZ)	Meek	Watt
Eshoo	Mfume	Waxman
Evans	Minge	Wheat
Faleomavaega	Mink	Williams
(AS)	Murphy	Woolsey
Fazio	Nadler	Wyden
Filner	Norton (DC)	Wynn
Fish	Oberstar	Yates
Flake	Obey	
Ford (MI)	Oliver	

NOES—256		
Allard	Callahan	Ewing
Andrews (NJ)	Calvert	Fawell
Applegate	Camp	Fields (LA)
Archer	Canady	Fields (TX)
Armey	Cardin	Fingerhut
Bacchus (FL)	Castle	Foglietta
Baessler	Chapman	Fowler
Baker (CA)	Clement	Franks (CT)
Baker (LA)	Clyburn	Gallely
Ballenger	Coble	Gallo
Barlow	Coleman	Geren
Barrett (NE)	Combust	Gibbons
Bartlett	Condit	Gilchrest
Barton	Cooper	Gillmor
Bateman	Costello	Gilman
Bentley	Cox	Goodlatte
Bereuter	Cramer	Goodling
Billirakis	Crane	Gordon
Bliley	Crapo	Goss
Blute	Cunningham	Grams
Boehlert	Danner	Grandy
Boehner	de la Garza	Hall (OH)
Bonilla	DeLay	Hall (TX)
Borski	Derrick	Hancock
Boucher	Dickey	Hansen
Brewster	Doolittle	Hastert
Brooks	Dornan	Hayes
Browder	Dreier	Hefley
Bunning	Duncan	Hefner
Burton	Edwards (TX)	Herger
Buyer	English (OK)	Hobson
Byrne	Everett	Hochbrueckner

Hoekstra	McDermott	Royce
Houghton	McInnis	Sabo
Huffington	McKeon	Sangmeister
Hughes	McMillan	Santorum
Hunter	McNulty	Sarpalius
Hutchinson	Meehan	Saxton
Hutto	Menendez	Schaefer
Hyde	Meyers	Schiff
Inglis	Mica	Shaw
Inhofe	Michel	Shays
Istook	Miller (FL)	Sisisky
Jefferson	Mineta	Skaggs
Johnson (CT)	Moakley	Skeen
Johnson, E.B.	Molinari	Skelton
Johnson, Sam	Mollohan	Slaughter
Kanjorski	Montgomery	Smith (IA)
Kaptur	Moorhead	Smith (MI)
Kasich	Moran	Smith (NJ)
Kennedy	Morella	Smith (OR)
Kennelly	Murtha	Smith (TX)
Kim	Myers	Snowe
King	Natcher	Solomon
Klink	Neal (NC)	Spence
Knollenberg	Nussle	Spratt
Kolbe	Ortiz	Stearns
Kyl	Orton	Steinholm
Lambert	Oxley	Stump
Lancaster	Packard	Sundquist
LaRocco	Pallone	Synar
Laughlin	Parker	Tanner
Lazio	Paxon	Tauzin
Leach	Payne (VA)	Taylor (MS)
Levy	Peterson (FL)	Taylor (NC)
Lewis (CA)	Pickett	Tejeda
Lewis (FL)	Pickle	Thomas (CA)
Lightfoot	Pombo	Thomas (WY)
Linder	Pomeroy	Thompson
Livingston	Portman	Thornton
Lloyd	Poshard	Thurman
Lowe	Price (NC)	Torkildsen
Maloney	Pryce (OH)	Trafigant
Mann	Quinn	Underwood (GU)
Manton	Rahall	Upton
Manzullo	Ramstad	Valentine
Margolies-	Ravenel	Visclosky
Mezvisky	Regula	Vucanovich
Markley	Richardson	Weldon
Mazzoli	Roberts	Whitten
McCandless	Roemer	Wilson
McCloskey	Rogers	Wise
McCollum	Rohrabacher	Wolf
McCrery	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (FL)
McCurdy	Roth	Zeliff
McDade	Roukema	

NOT VOTING—26		
Ackerman	Hoke	Ridge
Andrews (TX)	Kingston	Romero-Barcelo
Carr	Klecza	(PR)
Conyers	Lehman	Rose
de Lugo (VI)	Lipinski	Shuster
Farr	Miller (CA)	Towns
Frost	Neal (MA)	Washington
Green	Owens	Young (AK)
Gutierrez	Porter	Zimmer

□ 1840
The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:
Mr. Klecza for with Mr. Porter against.
Ms. SNOWE, Mrs. MALONEY, Messrs. KENNEDY, MOAKLEY, and MARKEY, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. MEEHAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."
Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mrs. MEEK changed their vote from "no" to "yea."
So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER
The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] for a recorded vote on which further proceedings were postponed.
The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. HUNTER.

RECORDED VOTE
The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 149, noes 263, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]		
AYES—149		
Allard	Franks (NJ)	Nussle
Andrews (NJ)	Gallely	Orton
Applegate	Gallo	Oxley
Archer	Gekas	Packard
Armey	Gilchrest	Paxon
Bacchus (AL)	Gillmor	Petri
Baker (CA)	Gingrich	Pickle
Baker (LA)	Goodlatte	Pombo
Barcia	Goss	Portman
Bartlett	Grams	Pryce (OH)
Barton	Greenwood	Quinn
Bateman	Hall (TX)	Ramstad
Billirakis	Hancock	Ravenel
Bliley	Hansen	Reynolds
Blute	Hastert	Roberts
Boehlert	Hefley	Rogers
Boehner	Herger	Rohrabacher
Bonilla	Hoekstra	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Houghton	Roth
Buyer	Huffington	Rowland
Callahan	Hunter	Royce
Calvert	Hutchinson	Saxton
Camp	Hyde	Schaefer
Canady	Inglis	Schenk
Chapman	Inhofe	Schiff
Clinger	Istook	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Jacobs	Shaw
Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Skeen
Combust	Kasich	Smith (NJ)
Condit	Kim	Smith (OR)
Crane	King	Smith (TX)
Crapo	Knollenberg	Solomon
Cunningham	Kolbe	Spence
Deal	Kyl	Stearns
DeLay	Lazio	Steinholm
Diaz-Balart	Levy	Stump
Dickey	Lewis (CA)	Sundquist
Doolittle	Lewis (FL)	Talent
Dornan	Lightfoot	Taylor (NY)
Dreier	Linder	Thomas (WC)
Duncan	McCandless	Torkildsen
Dunn	McCollum	Trafigant
Edwards (TX)	McHugh	Valentine
Emerson	McInnis	Vucanovich
Everett	McKeon	Walker
Ewing	McMillan	Walsh
Fawell	Mica	Weldon
Fields (TX)	Michel	Wolf
Fowler	Miller (FL)	Young (FL)
Franks (CT)	Moorhead	

NOES—263		
Abercrombie	Brown (OH)	Dellums
Andrews (ME)	Bryant	Derrick
Bacchus (FL)	Bunning	Deutsch
Baessler	Byrne	Dicks
Ballenger	Cantwell	Dingell
Barca	Cardin	Dixon
Barlow	Carr	Dooley
Barrett (NE)	Castle	Durbin
Barrett (WI)	Clay	Edwards (CA)
Becerra	Clayton	Engel
Beilenson	Clement	English (AZ)
Bentley	Clyburn	English (OK)
Bereuter	Coleman	Eshoo
Berman	Collins (IL)	Evans
Bevill	Collins (MI)	Faleomavaega
Bilbray	Cooper	(AS)
Bishop	Coppersmith	Fazio
Blackwell	Costello	Fields (LA)
Bonior	Cox	Filner
Borski	Coyne	Fingerhut
Boucher	Cramer	Fish
Brewster	Danner	Flake
Brooks	Darden	Foglietta
Browder	de la Garza	Ford (MI)
Brown (CA)	DeFazio	Ford (TN)
Brown (FL)	DeLauro	Frank (MA)

Furse	Manzullo	Sabo
Geddeson	Margolies-	Sanders
Gephardt	Mezvisinsky	Sangmeister
Geren	Markey	Santorium
Gibbons	Martinez	Sarpalius
Gilman	Matsui	Sawyer
Glickman	Mazzei	Schroeder
Gonzalez	McCloskey	Schumer
Goodling	McCrery	Scott
Gordon	McCurdy	Serrano
Grandy	McDade	Sharp
Gunderson	McDermott	Shays
Hall (OH)	McHale	Shepherd
Hamburg	McKinney	Sisisky
Hamilton	McNulty	Skaggs
Harman	Meehan	Skelton
Hastings	Meek	Slattery
Hayes	Menendez	Slaughter
Hefner	Meyers	Smith (IA)
Hilliard	Mfume	Smith (MI)
Hinchee	Mineta	Snowe
Hoagland	Minge	Spratt
Hobson	Mink	Stark
Hochbrueckner	Molinari	Stokes
Holden	Mollohan	Strickland
Horn	Montgomery	Studds
Hoyer	Moran	Stupak
Hughes	Morella	Swett
Hutto	Murphy	Swift
Inslie	Murtha	Synar
Jefferson	Myers	Tanner
Johnson (CT)	Nadler	Tauzin
Johnson (GA)	Natcher	Taylor (MS)
Johnson (SD)	Neal (NC)	Tejeda
Johnson, E.B.	Norton (DC)	Thomas (CA)
Johnston	Oberstar	Thompson
Kanjorski	Obey	Thornton
Kaptur	Olver	Thurman
Kennedy	Ortiz	Torres
Kennelly	Pallone	Torricelli
Kildee	Parker	Tucker
Klein	Pastor	Underwood (GU)
Klink	Payne (NJ)	Unsoeld
Klug	Payne (VA)	Upton
Kopetski	Pelosi	Velazquez
Kreidler	Penny	Vento
LaFalce	Peterson (FL)	Visclosky
Lambert	Peterson (MN)	Volkmer
Lancaster	Pickett	Waters
Lantos	Pomeroy	Watt
LaRocco	Poshard	Waxman
Laughlin	Price (NC)	Wheat
Leach	Quillen	Whitten
Levin	Rahall	Williams
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Wilson
Livingston	Reed	Wise
Lloyd	Regula	Woolsey
Long	Richardson	Wyden
Lowey	Roemer	Wynn
Machtley	Rostenkowski	Yates
Maloney	Roukema	Zeliff
Mann	Roybal-Allard	
Manton	Rush	

NOT VOTING—26

Ackerman	Kingston	Ridge
Andrews (TX)	Klecza	Romero-Barcelo
Conyers	Lehman	(PR)
de Lugo (VI)	Lipinski	Rose
Farr	Miller (CA)	Shuster
Frost	Moakley	Towns
Green	Neal (MA)	Washington
Gutierrez	Owens	Young (AK)
Hoke	Porter	Zimmer

□ 1847

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kingston for, with Mr. Kleczka against.

Mr. Porter for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mr. BRYANT changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MAZ-

ZOLI] having assumed the chair, Mr. DURBIN, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 241) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, due to a recent series of previously scheduled town hall meetings and individual meetings with constituents I was unable to register my votes.

Had I been present:

Rollcall votes 426, 427, and 429. I would have voted "no" on No. 426 and No. 427 and "aye" on No. 429.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1490

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 1490.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] be able to take the 60 minute special order granted for today to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

□ 1850

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. LAROCOCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for today, September 13, 1993, be allocated to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

FACTFINDING TRIP TO CROATIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, last week I returned from a fact-finding trip in Croatia which was sponsored by the Congressional Human Rights Foundation. Accompanying me on this trip were my legislative director, Brian Dean, and Stuart Feldman of Senator HATCH's staff. The delegation visited Zadar, Zagreb and Split. By the end of the month, unless the United States and the United Nations act forcefully and creatively, the war in the former Yugoslavia will spread from Bosnia and Herzegovina back into Croatia.

Mr. Speaker, this must be stopped at all costs, but it will require creative diplomacy on the part of the United States, as well as an understanding by the international community, that firm action must be taken to prevent the spread of the war.

The United Nations Security Council Resolution 743 of February 1992 authorizes a protection force to demilitarize the protected areas in Croatia and to create conditions making the return of all displaced persons and refugees to their homes in these protected areas possible. The United Nations has failed in accomplishing this mandate. Refugees continue to flee the protected areas, and none have returned. Paramilitary forces in the protected areas have not been disarmed, and weapons and forces are entering the protected areas from Bosnia and Herzegovina. The United Nations forces are permitting the denial of water and electricity to coastal cities such as Zadar and Biograd by occupying forces in the protected areas. Under the, quote, watchful eye, unquote, of the United Nations shelling is continuing in civilian areas from the UNPA's. Two civilians were killed 2 weeks ago in the Croatian city of Zadar by shells fired from the protected areas. Last week, on Friday, an artillery attack was launched on Karlovac killing 11 people, and on Friday, a shell hit Zagreb with 9 wounded.

The United Nations protective forces, UNPROFOR for short, have permitted paramilitary forces to repeatedly shell the Maslenica bridge, which is the only land corridor connecting central Croatia to its southern coast. UNPROFOR in Croatia is serving as a shield for the militarization of the region and increasing the likelihood of another all-out Serbo-Croat war when the United Nations mandate expires at the end of the month. If the mandate is renewed without change, refugees and displaced persons will not be able to return to their homes, and ethnic cleansing will once again have succeeded. Civilians living in the areas adjacent to the protected areas will continue to live under the threat of arbitrary shelling from forces within those protected areas, and drinking water and electricity will remain cut off to cities and villages in Croatia. A protected U.N. stay, under the current mandate, creates a de facto

autonomous state within the internationally recognized borders of Croatia, a ministate created through borders altered by force and the forced relocations of civilian populations. Thus, the mandate should be strengthened and renewed.

Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a concurrent resolution urging the United Nations Security Council to give the unperformed mandate the teeth it needs to disarm occupying forces. This resolution also urges the Security Council to create conditions permitting the immediate return of refugees and displaced persons to their homes, to require the reopening of the safe land corridor connecting northern Croatia with its southern coastal regions and to demand that water and electricity being denied to civilians in coastal Croatia be restored immediately. I have sent letters to the President, to Secretary of State Christopher and the United Nations Ambassador Albright asking them to make administration policy along these lines as the unperformed mandate expires. Attention has been focussed on the horrors that have occurred in Bosnia, however we should not ignore a parallel situation which could trigger another round of bloodshed in Croatia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I just want to urge the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] though to focus on this issue carefully. I, as the gentleman knows, was a strong supporter of Croatia, and I still am, but I have a bill in to take away the most-favored-nation status from Croatia because Croatia now has 5,000 regular army people fighting in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and, if the gentleman has been reading the news reports and reading the intelligence reports, Croatian forces have been involved in ethnic cleansing of Moslems in that area, and President Tudjman has the ability—

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Reclaiming my time, which is not in great quantity, let me say that the trip report I have submitted to the Congressional Human Rights Foundation very clearly states my urging the Croatian regular army forces be pulled out of Bosnia-Herzegovina and counterproductive activities, such as Croatian forces obstructing U.N. relief convoys, cease immediately.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

To date, more than 150,000 Bosnians have been killed in a bloody war on the soil of the former Yugoslavian state, in the heart of the European continent, 150,000 men, women, and children have been tortured, raped and massacred while the free world looked on. A world that claims to protect freedom and human rights. A world that has said genocide should never occur again. A world that pretends to have learned the lessons of the past.

Last week, Bosnian President Alija Izetbegovic visited the United States and

asked for the help and support of this free world. His pleas remained unanswered. Unanswered foremost by the European powers who are unwilling or unable to stop the bloodshed in their backyard. They reject lifting the arms embargo on the Sarajevo government, thereby depriving the Bosnian Moslems of their ability to defend themselves. Instead they have been acquiescing to the partition of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the triumph of Serbian and Croatian aggression. In their opinion, a solution has to be found with the agreement of all concerned parties, even if such an agreement means to reward the persecutor and punish the persecuted. A division of Bosnia along ethnic lines would be—to use Mr. Izetbegovic's words—a "Capitulation of Legality to Force."

Dividing up Bosnia along ethnic lines is a disgrace, and bears little hope for a lasting peace in the Balkans. To the contrary, Serbs and Croats plan to divide Bosnia among themselves, and will claim the lands they have occupied by force. The Serbs will not stop there, but continue their bloody raid by trying to gobble up their smaller neighbors.

The next victim of Serbian aggression will be Kosova, where the 90 percent Albanian majority already suffers a silent ethnic cleansing. I have seen the devastating situation in Kosova firsthand. Albanians are fired from their jobs, Albanian hospitals are closed, and children are denied access to schools because of their ethnic affiliation.

The stakes in Kosova are high. If the Serbians do resort to open bloodshed in Kosova, Albania, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Turkey, and Greece are likely to be dragged into the conflict. This would result in a refugee crisis that would rival and possibly eclipse the disaster we are still witnessing in Bosnia.

Madam Speaker, it is not too late for action in the former Yugoslavia. I urge the United Nations to lift the arms embargo on Bosnia and allow the Bosnian Moslems to defend themselves. And I strongly urge for the deployment of peacekeeping forces in Kosova.

If the free world does not act now, we all will be guilty of having allowed the extinction of a people living in the heart of Europe. If we really have learned the lessons of the past we cannot close our eyes and turn our backs on another genocide.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

SAVINGS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAROCO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAROCO. Madam Speaker, I want to take a few minutes again today to speak to the House about savings in America.

As I have noted in previous special orders on this issue, Americans don't save very much money.

Our personal savings are about half what they were 15 years ago, and we weren't big savers even back then.

Various changes in our economy and tax policies have failed to stem the declining rate of savings.

Even in the mid-1980's, when we had massive tax cuts and high interest

rates at the same time, Americans did not increase our personal savings rate.

In the early 1970's, 9 percent of take home pay was saved. We're saving about a third that much now.

Some economists had predicted that when the baby boomers started having children of their own, they would also start saving. The early returns indicate that baby boomers are in fact saving a little more as they age, but not as much as their parents did at the same age.

Well, Madam Speaker, we have another chance to get our savings rate up, and I hope that we don't let it get away from us. If we try, we might be able to get Americans to save some of the unexpected money they now find in their possession because they have refinanced their mortgages.

This year, a large majority of the American families who have home mortgages are seeing extra dollars in their pockets as a result of refinancing to take advantage of lower interest rates.

These extra dollars are part of the money that families budgeted for and expected to mail off as house payments.

When the Smith family got its original, higher rate mortgage a few years ago, their lender calculated that they could afford payments of—for example—\$700 a month.

Now, with interest rates down, the Smiths have refinanced and they make a mortgage payment of only \$550 a month.

That's \$150 a month in more or less unanticipated money in the Smith family cash box—almost \$2,000 a year.

Now, multiply the Smith's small windfall by literally millions of American families. Mortgage refinancing is going on all over the country, with high-income and lower income families and big mortgages and small mortgages.

As a result of this furious refinancing activity, about \$4½ billion that American families had budgeted for mortgage payments won't be going to their mortgage holders this year.

So, is there any chance that a decent share of this windfall will be saved?

For the sake of our country, it had better be.

We've all heard the comparisons before, but I think we need to hear them again. Americans save less than the citizens of every one of the other G-7 countries, the countries with developed economies.

This means that not only the Japanese—who are the world's premiere savers—but the Italians, the Germans, the French, the British, and the Canadians all save more of their take-home pay than we do.

We spend more on ice cream and we have more TV sets per household, but we save less. Let me add, we also pay less in taxes than citizens of the other

countries I named, so tax burden isn't the reason for our anemic savings rate.

What I would like to do this afternoon is to issue a challenge to the bankers, investment counselors, retirement planners, and mortgage refinancees of America. I would like to challenge these financial professionals to go after the Smiths and the money that has been freed up in their family budget because of their new mortgage. Convince them to save some of it before it burns a hole in their pockets.

Whether the money goes into CD's, bank savings accounts, IRA's, stocks, bonds, or other instruments is not the big issue. The big issue is the need to put some money away instead of spending it all immediately.

This is a challenge we have to meet if there is going to be college money for our children, retirement money for ourselves, and investment money for the American economy.

It's a matter of personal responsibility. It's a matter of national survival.

Madam Speaker, I will be returning to this topic in the days to come.

□ 1900

COMMITTEE ON RULES ATTEMPTS TO DISCHARGE DISCHARGE PETITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam Speaker, on August 4 we had a special order to introduce something here to many of the Members of Congress who were not familiar with it, a system called a discharge petition. Since that time there has been a lot of attention drawn to it. Since that time also, I might add, we have secured the names of 218 Members who have signed the discharge petition, along with nine more waiting in line and wanting to do it.

But I wanted to use this time just to mention the fight is not over yet. Tomorrow there will be a Committee on Rules meeting at 9:30 where I will be testifying, and I anticipate that they are going to try to come up with some excuse to torpedo this thing, which I think reflects the wishes of the people.

Real briefly, the three arguments that are used against it are really phony. One is it will destroy the committee system.

Madam Speaker, under the best of circumstances, it would take at least 6 weeks to get 218 signatures on a discharge petition. The rules say you wait 30 days before you do that, and then 7 legislative days after that. Then it can only come up on a second or fourth Monday. That means it will take at least 3 months.

I suggest if a committee chairman was not willing to have a hearing on a

bill in that many months, then maybe the committee system does need a little changing.

One of the most ridiculous arguments is if we do this, the lobbyists and special interests will find out what we are doing around here.

Madam Speaker, let me tell you, the lobbyists and special interests know what we are doing; it is the people that do not know.

The third argument is it will lead to bad law. The interpretation of those who have been in the leadership around here is anything they do not want is bad law. Limited terms is bad law; budget balancing amendment to the Constitution is bad law; the line item veto is bad law. So I think this merely reflects the wishes of the people.

I would say this also: that the discharge petition process is the last vehicle available to express the will of the majority in Congress.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS].

Mr. MCINNIS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Madam Speaker. I think what we have to assess is why did my colleagues and the Members of this Congress sign that discharge petition? The reason they signed it is because the American people have said, "We want more open government." The American people have said government has got to change. The American people have said the Government needs to respond to openness, that government needs to do its business in the open, the Government needs to be honest with the people that it represents, and that is why they signed this discharge petition.

Well, guess what? Tomorrow morning in the Committee on Rules the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] is going to see people refusing, denying the people of this country.

Madam Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] continues to get the kind of press he has gotten nationwide, to open up the government system, to open up Congress, and to change the way Congress is doing its business. All I can say is I hope the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE], I hope tomorrow you can learn a few verses from the song "Times, They Are A'Changing," and I hope you have that opportunity to rehearse it there in front of them.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS], because times are clearly changing. People are more informed, and people are not going to tolerate this old secret way of doing business.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Madam Speaker, I compliment the gentleman for his time, commitment, and energy to help open up government and open up this institution. I truly am, as a new Member of Congress, outraged at the Committee

on Rules, how it controls the process that has led to making the Congress a very partisan institution.

If I had been asked a year ago, "Steve, you have an option: you can either control the substance, or you can control the process; which do you choose?"

A year ago, as a citizen of this country, I would have said, "I would like to control the substance." Now, as a Member of this Congress, I would say that is wrong. If you control the process, you control the substance, and that is what the Committee on Rules does.

This is just another answer to those who have been attacking the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] and others of us even here, saying, "You represent those special interest groups. See how fast that undue pressure? It only took 3 weeks to get 218 signatures."

Madam Speaker, that confuses me, because the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE], I know, has been working over 6 months. How long has the gentleman been working on this?

Mr. INHOFE. Madam Speaker, we are talking about years. As far as this discharge petition is concerned, it has been 6 months. It is a long, arduous process of getting that number. To have someone suggest that it happened in 3 weeks, of course, it is just that they are ill-informed.

Mr. BUYER. Madam Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE], it is a compliment, though, when they say you represent special interests, when it is the special interest of the American people on issues of the line item veto, the balanced budget, and term limitations.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I would yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT].

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, first I want to congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] for the marvelous job the gentleman has done to open up government.

Madam Speaker, I would like to ask a question: how can people who signed on this discharge petition turn around and vote for a procedure to gut the very discharge petition we are talking about?

Mr. INHOFE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that question. I do not think it is going to happen. We have two lists here. This list is 218 people who signed discharge petition No. 2. The other is nine people standing in line who have stated they are going to do it.

Madam Speaker, I do not think there is one individual who signed that who would then turn around and vote for a procedural vote that would gut and torpedo the system. So it is not going to happen. The people are going to win this one.

LET THE SUN SHINE IN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, for months Members of the minority have labored to inform the American people about how the majority leadership uses its absolute power to stifle debate and sidetrack meaningful reform. We've even used display charts showing the dramatic increase in closed rules and restrictive rules—both of which disenfranchise members of both parties and diminish opportunity for full deliberation.

The status quo around here has capitalized on the fact that many of its methods for shutting off debate and killing worthwhile proposals for change are procedural, and not attention-getting in the eyes of the news media, no sex appeal, in advertising terms. In short, the leadership has hidden behind procedure to influence the substance of what we do. But last week we had a breakthrough—thanks to the Wall Street Journal, talk radio and an American public fed up with business-as-usual, the House—led by JIM INHOFE of Tulsa, OK—was able to muster the needed 218 signatures on a discharge petition—the first step toward a significant reform in the rules.

Our goal is to let the sun shine in onto the inner workings of the house—to provide the people with an accurate measuring stick to rate their Representatives and to provide opportunity for debate and voice on some issues that enriched leadership has arbitrarily and in some cases arrogantly bottled up. What we are attempting is simply to lift the veil of secrecy that currently surrounds the discharge petition process. Why is this so important? Why does this change have significant potential consequences? The way things stand now, a handful of incredibly powerful committee chairmen have the ability to kill popular legislative proposals by effectively burying them in committee. This is what is happening to legislation implementing national term limits; it's happening to the many worthwhile proposals for spending cuts; it's happening to the repeal of the onerous Social Security earnings test; and it's happening to the notch fix.

The only recourse that sponsors and supporters of these bills have is the arcane process of the discharge petition. Under this procedure, if 218 Members of this House—that's 50 percent plus one—sign such a petition then a bill may be released from committee and can come straight to the floor. But discharge petitions are rarely successful because the list of those who sign is kept secret.

This means Members can tell their constituents they support a bill even though they aren't willing to go the

extra mile to actually get the bill passed.

By making the names public, Members will have to be up front about their level of support for a particular bill.

I know that after all the recent fanfare many Americans believe we have won this battle—and opened up the process. But the leadership around here knows that there are many ways to block reform—and they are not about to give up their absolute power without a fight. So we are alert to counter moves—look-alike, sound-alike but do-nothing proposals of their own designed to sidetrack real reform. They did it with the line-item veto. And they attempted to do it during the House bank and post office scandals but public outrage was too great.

But we can win the fight for reform—if the American people keep watching and keep making themselves heard. Don't be fooled by a poor substitute—hold out for the Inhofe resolution—hold out for real reform.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE].

Mr. INHOFE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], as a member of the Committee on Rules, and, of course, I am not on the Committee on Rules, but I have read a couple of things to expect as to what they might try to do. Does the gentleman have any idea what that would be?

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, I am very happy to reclaim my time to try to explain this, that there are actually a number of options that the Committee on Rules could take to sort of sidetrack the effort that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] has made so far.

The Committee on Rules has not made any such determination. The fact is it is meeting now on other matters, and the fact is it is going to have hearings tomorrow. It is impossible to predict what the outcome will be. But I think it is very beneficial to remind the Committee on Rules that there are 218 Members of this body, plus several others who have indicated an interest as well, in seeing this matter come to a vote on the question of the secrecy in the discharge. I think that is a very clear, loud message, and those of us who favor that will certainly be reminding those in the Committee on Rules during the Committee on Rules hearing.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam Speaker, after the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS] proceeds, I have another comment to make.

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS].

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] predicted last week that the Committee on Rules may try

to sidetrack this discharge petition. I thought at that time that the gentleman may have a bit of paranoia. But Roll Call this morning reported that the discharge bill may be gutted. It goes on to say that the Committee on Rules at this present time is plotting their strategy.

I would ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE], why in the world would the Committee on Rules try to gut this bill, when Americans are calling for more openness and more honesty from their Representatives, and for reform of Congress, and the discharge petition of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] goes further than anything on the floor of this House?

Mr. INHOFE. I appreciate the question from the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS]. I know I can only respond by saying that I do not think they are going to be able to do it. I think that any attempt to subvert the discharge petition, the only means, this is the only vehicle by which the will of the majority of the House, which reflects the will of the American people, can be heard, and I do not think it is going to happen. And I appreciate that question.

□ 1910

I would like to make a comment in the form of a question to the gentleman from Florida, who is on the Committee on Rules. It is my understanding that any of the procedures or scenarios that I have seen that the Committee on Rules can come up with are going to ultimately require a recorded vote; is that correct?

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I believe that the gentleman from Oklahoma has properly characterized the circumstance, but never underestimate the creativity of the Committee on Rules. I think we have all learned that.

My view is that one way or another, either on this floor in one manifestation of this House in operation or another, we will have to have a vote of the House, of the Members of this House, on some aspect of this. So the vote will come forward some way.

Mr. INHOFE. I think that is what you accomplish when you do get your 218th signature. At least it says that that committee of jurisdiction, in this case the Committee on Rules, will be released, discharged from their jurisdiction. But that will not happen until the 27th of September.

Mr. GOSS. Even if the gentleman's discharge petition did not come to a vote on the date certain that has been selected for it, some other Committee on Rules opportunity, some issue would be out there that they would have had to create, and it would essentially be the same issue.

Mr. INHOFE. I have talked to a number of the Democrats who have signed

Discharge Petition No. 2. I have yet to find one who is not going to see it through.

In other words, if you sign a discharge petition to discharge a bill, to do away with the secrecy and the discharge system, you are not going to turn around then and vote for a procedure that is going to torpedo that entire effort.

Mr. GOSS. Let me be clear that the purpose of this is to remove the secrecy from the discharge so that we can get on with some of the other benefits that come from that process that have been explained. I do not believe that any gutting amendments, any cute changes in the program, any watering down, any pale imitations will pass the laugh test. I believe there are enough people watching on this now so that that is not going to happen.

I am not saying it cannot happen. I am saying it is not likely to happen, as long as there is as much interest as I see in this Chamber tonight and as much interest as I see in the media abroad in our country.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. I thank him for having this short special order just to explain what might happen in the Committee on Rules. I appreciate his support very much.

ON THE NATIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 2245

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, last week the spotlight turned to Vice President AL GORE and the findings of his eagerly awaited National Performance Review. After the narrow passage of the President's budget and the ever-growing demand by the public for more and bigger cuts in Federal spending, a great deal is riding on these recommendations to improve the management of the Federal Government.

After failing to eliminate one single Federal program from the fiscal year 1994 budget, performance review is President Clinton's second—and perhaps final—chance to convince the American people that he is serious about ending business as usual in Washington and bringing fiscal responsibility to the way the Federal Government spends our tax dollars.

An enormous question remains to be answered: Will the National Performance Review's 6-month exercise to bring efficiency and enhanced productivity to the Federal Government actually lead to improved performance and less expensive government? Will the National Performance Review, as the President promised last spring, rep-

resent a historic step in reforming the Federal Government? Or will it—like a long list of past reform efforts dating back to the Hoover Administration—produce only short-lived and largely symbolic changes in the Federal Government?

In our efforts to bring about a real revolution in the way the Federal Government works, we should look for two things that you don't often see here in Washington—clear thinking and political leadership. We must understand our goals and be truly determined about reaching them.

There need to be some basic principles that guide the creation of any sustained effort aimed at generating an effective and long-lasting performance review and evaluation system.

First, you need to forge a politically difficult but essential alliance uniting Congress, the President and the Federal bureaucracy. All these groups are powerful stakeholders in the Federal Government. And, if even one is excluded, the process is doomed from the outset. Whether under Presidents Kennedy, Carter or Reagan, every recent drive to improve Government efficiency has failed because it was sabotaged by at least one of these stakeholders who was never allowed to participate as a full partner at the decision-making table.

In some cases, upon completion of so-called reform efforts, Federal workers have been the ones who rebelled, dismissing as another useless paper chase new reporting requirements aimed at greater fiscal responsibility.

But Congress, by itself, lacks any sustained institutional focus on management improvement or performance. Consumed with the process of spending tax moneys Congress gives precious little attention to the results that spending achieves. Too often Congress in its enabling legislation micromanages the programs it creates, frustrating the Government managers who must in fact implement these programs.

Real change will only take place when there is an institutionalized, permanent, cooperative effort on the part of Congress, the Federal bureaucracy and the President to increase Government efficiency and build a framework that can be used to pare down spending. It must be a team effort, pushed by a public outraged at the way their tax dollars are being mishandled.

Second, a new approach to managing the Government requires tackling both the budget deficit and the so-called performance deficit. To address either successfully, you must do both.

The budget deficit provides the political impetus to sell the American people on the need to overhaul Government in order to improve the delivery of services. The same system of evaluation and review helping us to improve service can also support our efforts to reorder our spending priorities. Per-

formance review should not be viewed as a quick fix—an instant source of savings. When properly constructed, it involves a painstaking process of evaluating Government services and then making the tough choices as to what we must provide and what we can afford to do without.

Cutting out all managerial inefficiencies in the Federal Government is a worthwhile goal. And certainly one does not have to dig very far to uncover a gold mine of waste in the Federal bureaucracy. But if the President settles for just rooting out managerial inefficiency, the results of the National Performance Review will be short-lived and the budgetary savings will be minimal.

We need to make Government smaller—as well as more efficient. That's what real performance reviews and evaluations can help us do—enable us to reassess our priorities and subsequently reduce or eliminate non-essential spending.

Third, you must build a system that makes sense and is easy to follow. In the 1960's, there was programming budgeting. In the 1970's, there was zero-based budgeting. Both these efforts were meant to revolutionize government—but they never lived up to those lofty expectations. Both movements produced mounds of paperwork that were impossible for Government workers to understand and too cumbersome to implement. These improvements were quickly discarded.

And, finally, performance review must be a permanent way of doing business in Washington. The President has vowed that his performance review will be revolutionary. I don't know of any revolution that's been won in just 6 months. It takes years to earn the support of the principal stakeholders and to execute real change. If the President wants to lead this revolution, his administration must be committed to giving it the time and attention it deserves and to ensure this movement carries on long after he leaves office.

These are not just my ideas. These principles reflect extensive research into performance review conducted by a number of highly regarded individuals, including those who wrote a recent study on the subject for the Brookings Institution.

This spring I sought to put all these principals into action by introducing the Permanent Performance Review Act of 1993. This legislation would provide a permanent and comprehensive system of evaluating the Federal Government's performance. It would involve Congress, the President and the Federal agencies. The commission—which would include the four most powerful leaders in Congress—would supervise self-studies that would be undertaken by all the major government agencies. These self-studies would

serve as a starting point for a comprehensive performance evaluation and review. The final product would be a series of legislative recommendations that Congress would be required to consider.

I was pleased to receive an extremely positive response to this proposal from Professor Gerald Garvey of Princeton University, coauthor of a recent Brookings Institution study on performance review.

Madam Speaker, performance review can work. It can achieve President Clinton's bold goals of redesigning, re-inventing and reinvigorating the entire national government. But it won't happen merely with the release of the National Performance Review's findings. These recommendations should serve as the first step in a new direction—toward a leaner, more cost-efficient Government. But we can't stop here. If we never make the fundamental changes needed to institutionalize this new approach to managing tax dollars, National Performance Review will go the way of other reform movements. It will prove to have been just another fad that quickly went out of style, another grand expectation for Government never realized.

ON NAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Madam Speaker, the NAFTA agreement is so comprehensive that the study of it is much like peeling an onion * * * the more you peel, the more you cry, and the more difficult it becomes to continue peeling.

One of the layers that has been called to my attention by the Purcell sisters in Topeka, KS, who have been conducting study groups on the agreement, is the section (Appendix 1603.D.4) applying to the entry of temporary professional level workers into the United States from Mexico.

The section says that "the United States shall annually approve as many as 5,500 initial petitions of business persons of Mexico seeking temporary entry * * *".

Discussions of this section by proponents most often explain the need for this section by references to the need for engineers to come in to temporarily set up and or service machines sold into this country. And that sounds very reasonable to me.

But, under what circumstance would we have the need for a temporary hotel manager from Mexico, or a forester, or graphics designer, or mathematician, or range manager/conservationist or on and on from agriculturist/animal breeder through biologists and chemists to veterinarians and zoologists?

Over sixty professional job categories are covered—A to Z—which, as more

and more companies—in this country—are turning to more and more temporary workers makes me begin to worry about the ready availability of temporary workers in neighboring nations who—over time can come in here and be forgotten.

Last week the news carried unemployment figures back to the first of the year—some reported job losses as high as 400,000. Four hundred thousand American workers being laid off while many in the graduating class of '93—both high school and college—are still looking for jobs and we are considering as many as 5,500 temporary workers coming into this country every year.

I am going to have the list of professionals included in the RECORD later this week. Maybe I am being an alarmist. Maybe a Mexican company will move to the United States which has need of temporary teachers, temporary zoologists * * * maybe * * *

If not, then there seems to be a rather cynical pattern, possibly, being designed here. The lower skilled jobs will be exported to Mexico, the higher skilled workers imported in from Mexico * * * so that at both ends of the scale, competition in salaries can be brought into play on the American labor force.

Now, despite the huge market Mexico represents, in truth, Mexico's total economy is only 5 percent of ours and, except in certain industries—mainly agri-business and financial services—the further opening of Mexican markets will have little impact on the Gross Domestic Product [GDP] of the United States.

The most optimistic NAFTA supporters promise that 150,000 to 200,000 new jobs will be created in the United States if the NAFTA passes. However, during the debate on the Budget, James Carvell, representing the White House, reported that we should support job retraining programs because between 150,000 to 200,000 jobs would be lost when NAFTA passed and we will need to retrain all of these displaced workers.

Obviously, if you listen to the proponents—the NAFTA will be a wash in whether jobs are gained or lost. But, no one is discussing what kind of jobs we will gain—or lose.

However, if 5,500 Mexican professionals leave Mexico every year to come here for temporary employment * * * it will represent a major brain drain to such a small economy, such a poor nation.

There is no doubt in my mind that some of our companies will have more sales opportunities in Mexico after the NAFTA than they now have, but there will be more opportunities for their workers and their companies in the United States, also.

See how complex each layer of the onion skin becomes?

It is not enough to just read the words of the documents involved * * *

the real puzzle is how they are going to work * * * how they can work as written * * * how they are meant to work as written.

We will keep puzzling over this huge document and bring more of our questions to the floor * * * so you can think about it, too, Madam Speaker.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1340, RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION COMPLETION ACT

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-237) on the resolution (H. Res. 250) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1340) to provide funding for the resolution of failed savings associations, and for other purposes which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1920

TRIBUTE TO PAUL B. HENRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, today we are going to pay special attention and respect to a dear departed colleague, PAUL HENRY, who represented the Grand Rapids District in Michigan so well. We have a number of Members that will be speaking from both sides tonight.

To start off this hour of special orders, I yield to the chairman of our delegation, the Honorable JOHN DINGELL.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I always find it difficult to say goodbye to good friends, particularly those friends who have served in this institution as well and as honorably as has PAUL HENRY. Tonight in this House we join together to bid our good friend a fond farewell and to remember his contribution to our institution and to our lives.

There is one way to describe PAUL: He was one class act. He was a very decent, strikingly honest, and highly honorable and capable individual who worked very hard at his job—but even harder at just being a tremendous individual.

PAUL was elected to the Congress in 1984, and served five very productive terms. He sat on both the House Committee on Education and Labor and the Science, Space and Technology Committee. Shortly after PAUL was elected to Congress, he quickly established his reputation for fostering cooperation and good work on the Michigan congressional delegation.

PAUL was a team player in every sense of the word. He never let partisanship detract from his good work within our delegation and his genuine desire to help Michigan. He was widely

known and loved for his integrity, fairness, and kindness and those personal assets won PAUL much acclaim for his accomplishments from both sides of the aisle.

We thought of PAUL as just doing what was right. He authorized legislation to restructure the Commerce Department as the "U.S. Department of Manufacturing and Commerce" and worked tirelessly to forge a working relationship between government and our Nation's struggling manufacturing sector.

PAUL also was at the forefront of pressing for improvements in our Nation's air, water, and solid waste laws. He was a champion of national bottle legislation, and, on that score, I can tell you that I had many earnest discussions with PAUL about how to best accomplish those goals before the House Energy and Commerce Committee.

PAUL HENRY's personal and professional attributes have been widely recognized. The National Journal named him as a congressional "Rising Star" in 1990, and in his statement following PAUL's unfortunate death, President Clinton said this of PAUL:

It's tragic when such a productive and promising life is cut short much before its time. His personal courage and bravery will be an inspiration to us.

I believe all of us will miss our good friend, PAUL. We mourn his death. But, in the final analysis, we can be comforted by the fact that this good soul, who served this institution in a superb manner, who loved and provided for his family, and who served humanity in an extraordinary way, will rest in the good hands of the Lord.

I respectfully yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON], who was one of PAUL's closest friends.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], one of PAUL's closest friends in the House.

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for taking the time for this special order tonight.

There are so many things that could be said and so many memories. I rise to offer my condolences to PAUL's wife, Karen, and to his three children, and also to his mom and dad, Dr. Carl Henry and Mrs. Henry. As many know, Dr. Henry is one of the leading theologians in the United States, and was the founder of Christianity Today.

When we think of PAUL HENRY, there are a number of words that come to mind: Honesty; clearly he was one of the most honest people you could possibly meet; decency was another word; integrity is another word; character; just knowing PAUL HENRY, when you told him something you knew he would

do it, you could trust him absolutely, total character; courage to go through what he did; we never know what and how we will face it or react when the time comes, but that of courage.

He loved his family very, very deeply. Many times we would talk, when the House was in late at night, about our families. I had a daughter who graduated from Wheaton College, and PAUL was one of the more distinguished graduates of Wheaton College. I believe Dr. Henry went to Wheaton College.

We would talk about our kids. I have a daughter, another daughter, who works in New York City, and one of his daughters works in New York City. In fact, they both went to the same church, Trinity, up in New York City. He loved his family very, very much.

He loved his Lord. He loved the Lord. He lived his life in a way that clearly showed that his religious beliefs and his faith was something that was very, very important. He loved the Lord not only with his heart but he served Him. Much of what PAUL HENRY did, if you wanted to try to find out why he was the way that he was, the answer was to find out what he believed in and his faith. His faith was very, very important to him.

Lastly, and in closing, I would urge any Members that have not had the opportunity to call FRED, who was a very good friend of PAUL's, and try to borrow the film of his funeral.

□ 1930

Many Members went. There were well over 100 Members of the House and Senate that went. But for any Member who wanted to see his life, if they would just view the film of the funeral, it was a tribute to PAUL's life.

So in closing, let me just say I offer my prayers and best wishes to the family, his wife, Karen, and the three children, and Dr. Carl Henry and Mrs. Henry. I just know that they will get to be with PAUL again in the next life.

Many times we think this is going to be the good life. This life is going to be the good life. This life is not really very good, if you think about it. There is a lot of pain and suffering. The next life is the best life, and they will all be together in the next life, which will be a very good life.

Madam Speaker, it is with great sadness today that I rise to recognize the late PAUL HENRY for his service to the United States Congress and our Nation.

PAUL was not only a friend to so many of us on both sides of the aisle, but more importantly a well-respected and hard-working Member of the House. PAUL was a political scientist by training. He was educated at Wheaton College and received his Ph.D. from Duke University. He entered his career as a public servant soon thereafter, working as an assistant for former Representative John Anderson of Illinois. PAUL always had a deep desire to serve the people of his home State of Michigan, however, and returned to Michigan

to launch a campaign for the Michigan House in 1978. He was elected and served from 1979 to 1983, when he was elected to the Michigan Senate in 1983. Throughout his 6-year tenure, PAUL distinguished himself through his excellent service to the State of Michigan and its citizens.

PAUL was elected to the U.S. Congress in 1984 and quickly earned the well-deserved reputation as a detailed and effective legislator. For the last several years PAUL worked hard on behalf of his legislation regarding national deposits on glass, aluminum, and plastic beverage containers. As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, PAUL worked to streamline burdensome Government overregulation as well as improve the safety of the workplace for employees throughout the Nation. He also fought on behalf of civil rights for all citizens, and for tough crime legislation protecting our people and keeping criminals off the streets.

PAUL's devoted service and honesty has been recognized by his constituents. He was reelected in 1986, 1988, and 1990, in each instance receiving more than 70 percent of the vote. It is a credit to PAUL that in 1992 he easily won reelection with over 60 percent of the vote despite being gravely ill. His dedication to the people of Michigan and our Nation earned him the deep respect and admiration of all of us. His leadership and integrity will be sorely missed, but his service and contributions to our country will always be remembered. It is an honor for me to recognize PAUL HENRY for his public service, and my deepest sympathies go to PAUL's widow Karen, their three children, and PAUL's parents, Dr. and Mrs. Carl Henry.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the Democratic whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, having studied for the priesthood, I was taught to believe in miracles, and all of us in the Michigan delegation knew that PAUL HENRY was sick, but we held out hope that a miracle might happen and that the day that came would never come. But now that it has, I realize that the true miracle is the courage, and the bravery that PAUL HENRY showed in the face of unbelievable odds and unbeatable odds, and the passion with which he lived his life.

Madam Speaker, history tells us on the day that John Kennedy died, a tailor in New York City put up a sign on the door that read, "Closed today due to death in the family." That is I think how we all feel. It is like we have had a death in our family.

We did not see eye-to-eye on every issue, but I do not think there was a Member of this body who was more respected and more liked than PAUL HENRY, and we are all going to miss him. While flying out to the funeral last month, somebody asked me how he thought PAUL would be remembered, and it struck me then that PAUL HENRY was a man of some very interesting contradictions, very Midwestern contradictions. We know from the many

causes fought right here on this House floor that he was both soft-spoken and persuasive, self-deprecating and proud, deeply religious, as Mr. WOLF has indicated, yet a firm believer in man's ability to effect his own fate.

Politically PAUL was a deeply patriotic man who spoke out against flag burning, a fiscal conservative who voted in favor of extending unemployment benefits, a defense supporter who said no to both the MX missile and the Nicaraguan Contras. It seemed that PAUL was not so concerned with the right or the left as he was with the right and the wrong. He followed I think what we all strive to follow in our own public life and hopefully in our personal lives, an inner compass, and worked hard to make this country a better place to live, and I think that is how he is going to be remembered.

I always got the feeling that to PAUL the richest life, the fullest life is a life that is dedicated to helping others, whether through the Peace Corps as he did in his early career, or as a teacher as he did for many years before he came to the legislature in Lansing, and of course as a legislator here where he made his true mark. And if PAUL could see us I think paying tribute to him this evening, I have a feeling he would probably wonder what we were all doing standing around when there is so much work to be done.

I think sometimes if we had a few more PAUL HENRYS around here we would shout at each other a lot less and we would work together a lot more.

So, Madam Speaker, our thoughts today go out to PAUL's wife Karen and his children, Kara, and Jordan and Megan. Their father was a credit to this institution and to our State of Michigan, and we will miss him. In the days ahead as we lead this National through some difficult times, I hope we can all show a little bit of courage and bravery and dedication that marked PAUL HENRY's entire life. In the end, Madam Speaker, that would be the highest tribute we can pay to him.

Let me also say at the close of my remarks how much I appreciate and think the whole delegation appreciates the warm and touching friendship that FRED UPTON had with PAUL HENRY. FRED was with him through thick and thin on this floor and through the very difficult battle he had at the end of his life, and we all got strength from FRED as he reported to us on a regular basis of PAUL's health and spirits. And so FRED, thank you for going out of your way the extra mile to do something for one of the great people that have served here.

Mr. UPTON. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], a member of the Republican leadership and a classmate of Mr. HENRY's.

Mr. DELAY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. There are

so many things you can say about PAUL HENRY, but I think the thing that you can say the most about him, the character of the man, the feeling of the man, is that only a person like PAUL HENRY could have a friend like FRED UPTON.

PAUL and I did come to Congress together. I can remember those days in the freshman orientation where PAUL distinguished himself right off as a free thinker, an independent thinker, a person that took everything, every little detail seriously. And you could always count on PAUL knowing everything there was to know about the issue at hand. He carried that throughout his service here in the House, a serious man, a very intelligent man, but a man that was so warm, a man that certainly as the gentleman from Virginia said, had true faith, a man of God because he lived his faith. He did not carry it on his sleeve. He lived it every day, and he was an example of his love for his Lord.

PAUL HENRY was always a dear friend to everyone on this floor, as has already been said. But let me just tell of an incident. I will not get into the details. But it was a time when PAUL HENRY thought I was doing something that he did not approve of. And he came to me in a very loving way, and a very brotherly way, and we sat down on the floor. He explained his feelings to me and pointed out to me in a wonderful way, and changed my mind, which very seldom is done on the floor of this House. But PAUL did it in such a loving way that you had to listen to him, and you could always tell that he was being straightforward and honest with you, which is the kind of man that we all ought to be on this floor and in life. He is an example for all of us. He was an example to his children. He was an example to his wife, Karen. He will be sorely missed by them I know. But this House has been diminished by the vacating of the seat and PAUL HENRY leaving us.

We know where he is. We know where he is he is happy, and he is looking down on us and probably commenting on what has been going on on this floor, and bringing his soft-spoken voice to us I am sure.

I really miss him, and I know that those that knew him in this body miss him and will miss him always.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding in this very somber eulogy to an outstanding American, PAUL HENRY. I concur with all the remarks. I think he was just an outstanding person who will be missed greatly by both sides of the aisle.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR].

Mr. CARR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and want to associate myself with the remarks of Congressman DAVE BONIOR, particularly those that applaud and appreciate the friendship of RED UPTON and the friendship that he had with PAUL HENRY.

□ 1940

Madam Speaker, it was very true, I might say, particularly to the family that not a day went by that members of our delegation, people who knew PAUL, his friends, both here and around the county, were not thinking of him. We all could not crowd into his hospital room or his bedroom, we could not all make regular phone calls to the family; but yet we all were praying for PAUL every day. Not a day went by that I did not think about him. I know that he was a great help to me, that our good friend and colleague, FRED UPTON, took the time and attention to be that conduit of information and care from the delegation to the Henry family and to PAUL himself and to give us the news and, hopefully, the encouraging news of PAUL's recovery.

Unfortunately history shows that it had a different result. I want to join with all of my colleagues here and those who served with PAUL, who are no longer Members of Congress and who cannot be with us tonight, but I know who would share these remarks and expressing our condolences to Karen, to the children and to PAUL's parents.

PAUL was an engaging person, he was an engaging personality. PAUL was engaged: when you talked to PAUL, you were talking to a real person.

You could look him in the eye and you could see his eyes coming back at you, you could see that PAUL was listening to what you had to say, and that made it all the easier to listen when PAUL spoke.

So many times people will take to the microphones in the House and some will run into the Cloakroom. There are some people in little schoolrooms across America who, no matter what the question is, they have got their hands up, "Call on me, teacher, call on me."

Sometimes I think a disproportionate number of those people get elected to Congress because it does not matter what the topic is, it does not matter what the day is, they have got to stand up and they have got to talk.

That is probably good for our country, but when PAUL talked, it was from the heart, but it was also with a measure of intellect. When Paul said something, you wanted to listen. Any number of times here in the thick of debate, when passions were running high, sometimes it is very hard to get the House in order. I can think of no time that PAUL HENRY did not step to the podium but what the House became

quiet in respect to this kind and thoughtful person, and they listened to the points that he had to make because inevitably PAUL had something to say.

He chose his words well; he offended no one; he sought to include everyone, even his opponents, on the issue, into the discussion.

He left no one with no way out from their own arguments of their own beliefs. He respected people too much for that.

That is the kind of person we need in the Congress of the United States, and that is why, apart from our personal friendship, I am going to miss PAUL HENRY so very much.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. UPTON. I thank the gentleman, Mr. CARR.

Madam Speaker, at this point I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, this fall Congress will face many complex and difficult issues—health care, NAFTA, welfare reform, possibly campaign finance reform, and reforming Congress. Unfortunately, a colleague we grew accustomed to being in the thick of things and offering his own perspective won't be a part of that debate.

PAUL HENRY, a dear friend and colleague passed away after fighting valiantly for months against brain cancer. Our prayers continue to be with him, his wife Karen, and his children Kara, Jordan, and Megan; this is a difficult time for them. The strength they have shown has been a comfort for all of us.

I cannot think of a greater testament to PAUL than his wonderful family.

As are other Members of Congress, his staff, his friends, his family and all who knew PAUL, I too am deeply saddened. His death is a terrible loss for all of us and a terrible loss for this institution.

On both sides of this aisle, among Republicans and Democrats, liberals, conservatives, and moderates, PAUL HENRY was highly regarded for his keen intellect, his irreproachable integrity, and his thoughtful compassion. A Peace Corp volunteer in Africa, PAUL brought that same kind of compassion to his responsibilities here in the House of Representatives and to his constituents.

With his background as a college professor, PAUL demonstrated a logical and intellectual approach that stayed with him through his service in the State legislature and here in Congress.

Like his students we can say that we learned from him and from his knowledge. I wish I had the opportunity to serve with PAUL longer.

We often discussed issues before votes, and I enjoyed talking with him a great deal. I asked PAUL many questions during those times, and his answers were always helpful and they made me better prepared. And I be-

came better prepared because he would ask me questions as well about these issues, and we were more than just members of the same State, same party, we were friends. He will be greatly missed.

At a time when this institution is struggling so much within itself and with the difficult issues facing our country, more people like PAUL HENRY would be a blessing for the work which lies ahead.

PAUL was a deliberative and deep thinker—one of the brightest minds in Congress—a citizen legislator in the true vision of our Founding Fathers. There are not many Members that are sought out as PAUL was—to discuss issues and concerns.

"One of the rising stars in Congress," is what a respected news magazine said of PAUL HENRY in 1990. Yes, he truly was a star—not only as a legislator, but as a human being.

Madam Speaker, we ask ourselves why is it that a star which shined so brightly can so suddenly be extinguished? It is a question we ask ourselves many times when someone who has lived and is living such a full life as PAUL passes away before we think it is their time to go.

Madam Speaker, as the minority leader, Mr. MICHEL, said during PAUL's eulogy, PAUL's star is shining in the heavens above us right now. His presence in this Chamber will be missed, but his presence in our minds and the principles he embodied will stay with us forever.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. UPTON. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Madam Speaker, at this point I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, Chairman DINGELL, Mr. UPTON, and fellow colleagues, even though I am from Michigan—PAUL HENRY's home State—in all honesty—I probably knew PAUL less than any Member in this Chamber tonight. I had the opportunity to meet PAUL on a few occasions when I was in the Michigan House of Representatives. PAUL HENRY served in the Michigan House long before me, and PAUL HENRY established himself as a leader here, in the U.S. House, long before I arrived.

My colleagues have described PAUL HENRY in human terms—that I cannot—nor should I attempt. But, I would like to describe to my colleagues, and the American people, what I as a freshman Congressman have learned and seen through PAUL's illness and death.

I see a little of all of us, you, my colleagues, and you the American people,—in PAUL HENRY.

I see it, and with all due respect to PAUL HENRY and his family, not just through PAUL's death, but through the death of Roy Erickson, from my home

county of Menominee, in Michigan's upper peninsula.

Like PAUL HENRY—Roy Erickson was a husband and a father. Roy had 3 children, PAUL had 3. PAUL was 51, Roy was 35. Roy never was a State representative, nor a Member of Congress. He was a Menominee County Commissioner, District No. 4.

PAUL HENRY and Roy Erickson just did not live long enough. Roy was just 35, when he died 12 hours after PAUL HENRY passed away. Like PAUL, Roy had dreams, ambitions and a deep love for his family and his fellow citizens. Roy was a member of the Menominee County Board of Commissioners, he worked and farmed the land, and Roy, like PAUL, has a great love for our Creator, and was extremely active in his Church.

So Saturday, shortly after I learned of PAUL's death, I saw Roy's wife, Julie, amongst Menominee County's farmers giving of themselves, celebrating with friends and family—the dedication of another centennial family farm.

Neither of us knew then, that in just a few hours, Roy Erickson would suddenly be taken from us.

The centennial farm that we were celebrating is the same farm owned by the same family for 100 years. Neither PAUL HENRY or Roy Erickson lived to be 100. PAUL barely lived half as long as that farm. But both PAUL and Roy believed in and lived to better their family. Not just their immediate family, but they gave to their community family—whether it was the Menominee County Board of Commissioners, the Michigan State Legislature, or the U.S. Congress.

They both gave of themselves for us, so we can all be a better family. We are gathered here in this sacred chamber, or you the American people who are gathered with your family, to remember both men, in their own way, who dedicated their lives to you.

I am confident in saying that PAUL HENRY never met Roy Erickson here on Earth—but I know that they are both looking down on us tonight. And as we listened earlier to FRED UPTON's eulogy of PAUL HENRY, the man, the husband, the father, the politician, the Congressman, we were again reminded of PAUL HENRY's love of family, for all of us and his country.

There was another eulogy the day after PAUL HENRY's eulogy in a little Catholic Church in Birch Creek, Menominee County, MI, for the man, the husband, the father, the politician, the county commissioner. The eulogy will not be by Members of Congress, but by Roy's family and his neighbors.

I began these comments by communicating what I have seen and learned in the 72 hours after PAUL HENRY's death. Life is too short—true. We cannot predict our future—true. But, we can all learn from PAUL HENRY and

Roy Erickson. As the distinguished minority leader, Mr. MICHEL stated at PAUL's funeral—PAUL HENRY represented civility. Roy Erickson reminds us that civility begins at home—our immediate family, in our little local communities, like Birch Creek, like Menominee.

PAUL HENRY taught us about civility in our larger communities like Grand Rapids and the State of Michigan, but PAUL HENRY wanted that civility to truly be between us all—whether in a little town or a big town, whether in a little county building, the State legislature or even on the floor of this Congress.

So when we speak on this floor, or with one another—may PAUL HENRY remind us of our civility, our own morality, so we may learn from PAUL what he taught us and what appears on the front page of the order of his funeral service. "Learn to do right! Seek justice, encourage the oppressed. Defend the cause of the fatherless, plead the case of the widow. Come now, let us reason together, says the Lord."

As Congressman PAUL HENRY would say to us, as we begin debate on difficult issues such as NAFTA and health care reform. Come now, let us reason together—with civility. If we can learn civility as we deal with one another, then we have learned from the life of PAUL HENRY.

□ 1950

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from western Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, it is with deep respect for my former colleague, PAUL B. HENRY, that I join in this special order this evening. I want to thank the senior member of the Michigan delegation, JOHN DINGELL, and the senior Republican, FRED UPTON, for offering me and so many of my colleagues this occasion to honor PAUL.

Unfortunately, I did not have the opportunity to get to know PAUL well. His service and mine in the Congress overlapped for only the past 7 months. So my experience of him in office is gained largely secondhand—from hearing about his work from his many former colleagues who are now my colleagues—commenting on his integrity, his intelligence, his diligence in doing his job, and his respect for his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

There are instances every day where I am reminded of his example and challenged to meet the standards that he set. Many of my constituents in Michigan's second congressional district were represented by PAUL for the previous 8 years as part of the fifth congressional district under earlier district lines. I am reminded each week as I go home of the close attention he paid to his citizens and how important that is for good representation.

Constituents in the southern part of my district—west of Grand Rapids—are part of the same extended families, attend the same churches, learn at the same schools, read the same newspapers and listen to the same media. As such, their expectations for congressional service learned from PAUL are very high, and a challenge to meet.

Several of the members of my staff in Washington and in West Michigan worked for PAUL in years past—both on his personal staff and on his many and always successful campaigns. Their devotion to him speaks volumes about his character.

Finally, PAUL and I also share the membership in the same religious denomination, the Christian Reformed Church. Of special importance in our tradition is the belief that public service is and can be a noble vocation and moral call. For these and many other reasons, I feel a close affinity with PAUL.

PAUL was of great assistance to me in getting my start here in Congress. His Washington staff, headed by Mary Lobisco, was tremendously helpful during the early transition days of my coming to Congress. All of his Grand Rapids staff, headed by Anne Knox, were invaluable in training and advising my district staff in casework and other constituent relations. In addition, his staff on the Education and Labor Committee, on which I served with PAUL, was extremely helpful to me in learning the ropes of the committee. I owe a debt of gratitude to all of them, and to PAUL, for their willingness to help me and my staff get our feet on the ground, based on solid principles.

My friend and colleague FRED UPTON summed up PAUL's contribution to this institution very well during his eulogy at PAUL's memorial service—"Those of us who want to make Congress better should look to the marker established by PAUL * * * He was a principled leader in every sense of the definition, with all the respect and love one could have."

I miss PAUL. I had hoped to serve with him in the House of Representatives for a long time, to learn from him in many ways, and to join him in bettering this institution and in serving the people of western Michigan. I am sorry I did not have that chance. PAUL set a standard for integrity, intelligence and dedication to which we all should strive. The editorial page of one of my newspapers said it so well—"When death cuts short such a person's life, the most meaningful tribute we can make is to resolve to act with greater integrity in our lives. That is the way it is with well-lived lives. They serve as models for the rest of us. In that way a life lived with integrity never really dies."

Our prayers and thoughts continue for Karen and PAUL's family.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the Congressman very much for yielding to me.

FRED, you have been a wonderful friend to PAUL. You inspired us with your attentive and caring friendship. May we all have lots of close friends like you, or at least a few.

Well, it has been 6 weeks. We were going to do a special order in early August, but events were so hectic then that we never finished here, so it was decided to wait until we returned.

□ 2000

I am glad we did, because the passage of time has been a test, and that is:

Do we still remember, and do we still remember vividly?

And the answer of all of us who have come forth tonight is:

Very much so, very much so.

Those of us who were here can remember PAUL standing there 20 feet away. We remember some of the debate, his discussion of environmental issues, and he had a record of accomplishment on those. We can remember his discussion during the very, very controversial issues of the National Endowment for the Arts, and he was a voice of reason in that debate.

I remember working just a few feet away from PAUL on unemployment compensation issues, the extension of benefits. PAUL cared. He thought we should do something for those who were long-term unemployed through the area from which he came was clearly not the most heavily impacted by unemployment in Michigan or the country.

However, Madam Speaker, in these few minutes I would like, rather than talking about his accomplishments, because those have been noted earlier, to say a few words about two more personal matters: one, friendship, and the other, integrity. PAUL proved that friendship does matter.

I have such vivid memories: a parade; I think it was in Ionia. I do not quite remember why it was there. It was after I had run for Governor. I do remember that I was not running for anything. I believe I may have been there representing my brother, but, while the reason for being there is very foggy, my recollection of PAUL, Karen and the family, those recollections are very vivid. It must have been his district, and he welcomed me there, and my wife there, like long lost friends.

The family also clearly mattered. We walked together. I believe there was a buggy there for one of the children; it was that long ago. And I remember Karen's warmth, and we kind of walked down together, though I was not at all sure that it was to his advantage in his district to be walking down the street with me. It may have been better for

him to be greeting the crowd as their Representative, and it was a quite Republican area.

Madam Speaker, we had a lot of fun that day, and I remember it so vividly, and I also remember, not so far from here, when PAUL used to bounce down the steps, and sometimes we were in a hurry, we wanted to get across the street, running through traffic, back to our office. But for PAUL there was almost always time for a smile, for a conversation, for maybe a discussion of the issue. So, he was a wonderful friend.

He also had a wonderful sense of integrity. We could trust PAUL to tell us what was on his mind, rather unvarnished and rather unblemished. He did stand for honesty. He stood for integrity. PAUL had faith, and it surely served him, and Karen, and Kara, Jordan, and Megan as well.

I also think that he had a belief that there was life after death, also in the sense that goodness survives, that decency survives, that honesty survives and that friendship is remembered. He was so right.

Madam Speaker, we come here today to praise his accomplishment legislatively, but also to remember his goodness, his decency, his honesty, and to say to you, PAUL, and to the family, "Thanks for your everlasting friendship."

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], and, as he related the story about bounding down the steps, it reminded me, too, of all the times we would steal away into the cloakroom and buy a Klondike or a Dove bar, and we just sort of walked around to get out of the maze of some of the issues here, just be a person, and that is what PAUL was.

Mr. LEVIN. Very much so.

Mr. UPTON. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG].

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] for yielding to me this evening, and, Madam Speaker, before I share some thoughts with regard to our late colleague, PAUL HENRY, I would like to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] who shared a special relationship with PAUL, and of course the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] for putting together, organizing, this special order this evening to pay tribute to one of America's outstanding public servants who has left us much too soon.

Madam Speaker, our colleague, PAUL HENRY of Grand Rapids, MI, was a true role model, a role model not just for us here in this institution, but for all Americans. He was a dedicated husband and father, a committed public servant, active in his church and throughout the community. PAUL HENRY's motivation was not partisan advantage,

but to use his God-given ability to do his share to make the world a better place.

PAUL HENRY was a pioneer. When President Kennedy made the call to young Americans to form the Peace Corps, PAUL HENRY was one of the earliest volunteers working for America by helping the people of Ethiopia and Liberia.

PAUL HENRY began his career working for another former Member of this body, John Anderson of Illinois. When John Anderson offered an alternative voice within the Republican Party while seeking the GOP nomination in 1980, PAUL HENRY took up his cause following his convictions. He deserves our respect for not always doing what was popular, but doing what he felt was right, and, Madam Speaker, PAUL HENRY has done his share, made his mark and left us all the richer for having the benefit of his wisdom and the example of his leadership.

PAUL HENRY was truly one of Michigan's best and brightest, one of the best my home State could send to Washington. When we lose a colleague as bright and vital as PAUL HENRY, we feel a strong sense of loss here in this institution, and likewise the people of western Michigan, for whom PAUL HENRY had the honor of serving, understand the loss best when their best and brightest was no longer their voice in the people's House.

But clearly, Madam Speaker, the greatest loss is felt by the Henry family who remain in our prayers. Husband, father, teacher, leader, servant—PAUL HENRY has left us much too soon, but his legacy lives on in the strength and character of his family, his wife Karen, children Kara, Jordan, and Megan. They are an outstanding testimony to values and beliefs that PAUL HENRY held dear, and from that we should learn perhaps the most important of PAUL HENRY's life lessons.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, as my colleagues know, I cannot help but believe that PAUL HENRY was one of God's gifts to his family, to his community, to his children, to the State of Michigan, and to the United States of America.

I first came to know PAUL when he was on the State Board of Education in Michigan. We were subsequently elected to the Michigan House of Representatives in the same year, 1978. We served in the House for 4 years. In 1982 we were both elected to the Michigan Senate. We happened to be seatmates for the 4 years in the House. We were also seatmates in the Senate, and also our offices were next to each other.

□ 2010

It gave me the opportunity to discover the vigor that PAUL HENRY had

in trying to decide what was the best way to go in terms of policy decisions for the State of Michigan.

He was very interested in education. When he left to become a United States Congressman in 1984, before he left I took up some of his initiated efforts in the areas of education. Later those became Michigan law.

PAUL HENRY, I suggest, is not only one of God's gifts, but his wife, Karen, is also one of God's gifts to the community and to the church. They have raised a wonderful family. And PAUL HENRY is not going to just vanish from the face of the Earth. His life is going to be immortal in terms of the influence that he has had on other people. Certainly, the influence that he and Karen have had on Kara, Jordan, and Megan. Certainly the influence they have had on their church and community.

I commend, and hope to emulate, his dedication, his ability, and his perseverance, in trying to discover the best way to go, that is going to best help humanity.

So we share with his family the grief of their loss, but also celebrate the tremendous life and influence he has had.

Thank you, FRED, for the time.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, at this point I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT].

Mr. HASTERT. Madam Speaker, FRED UPTON, FRED, thank you for your efforts here, and certainly Chairman DINGELL, in having this special order.

I certainly join with our other Members of the House to pay tribute to a dear friend and colleague who passed away before his time. You know, as you stop and think about somebody we have known for a long time, I have known PAUL for a long time. It goes back almost 30 years to when PAUL and I were undergraduates together at Wheaton College. And you go back in time with those types of experience that you have together at a small college like that; PAUL was a year ahead of me in school, and he was my ROTC sergeant in my platoon. PAUL was a great leader in that respect, and he was also a stickler for shiny shoes and clean rifles, and handed out demerits when they needed to be.

But he lived his life like that. PAUL was a stickler. He was a stickler for what was right, for what was good, for what was decent, for what was fair, and for the rights of not just his electorate, but people all over this world; people who were downtrodden, people who needed help, and people who were too proud sometimes to reach out. And PAUL was there to work for those causes, to share.

As you talk about PAUL walking down the steps, we shared an office over in Cannon. And I know my first term in Congress, we were talking about families, about bringing the families back to Washington or leaving

them back at home in the district, and what was right. And PAUL was invaluable. He kind of put his arm around me, and I guess as an undergraduate still as he saw me, we shared those concerns, what is best for the family.

His wife Karen was teaching in school, just as my wife was teaching school back in Illinois, and we talked about the pros and cons of what we should do and how to make ends meet, as it was, as a new Member of Congress. And PAUL's friendship was certainly invaluable.

But his example, as we hear all the stories tonight and all the examples of how PAUL lived his life, I think certainly is the marker that any man, certainly any legislator, can lay out as a measure, as a measure that others following behind him can live up to, can follow, can try to emulate. And certainly the impact that PAUL HENRY put on this place, was certainly one that was indelible. It is here for a long time.

To remember the words and the deeds and the commitment of PAUL HENRY is certainly something that will not fade away in this place, as all too many voices do fade away in this place after the light goes out.

PAUL will be around here for a long time, his commitment of what he believed in, how he did the job, and his commitment to people.

So, FRED, I thank you for bringing this special order before us, you and Chairman DINGELL. It is something that is certainly fitting.

I want to extend again our great condolences to Karen and the family that PAUL loved so well. I know they can be proud of what he did and what he stands for. Certainly PAUL was one who loved his Lord, and that gift to his family will last forever.

Thank you very much.

Mr. UPTON. Thank you very much, DANNY.

Madam Speaker, I would insert in the RECORD at this point a number of articles relating to PAUL HENRY. First a eulogy delivered by the Republican leader, Mr. MICHEL; the eulogy delivered by myself; a story written in the Detroit Free Press by Karen Schneider and Jean Calmen; an editorial on PAUL's accomplishments from the Detroit Free Press; an editorial in the Grand Rapids Press; an editorial in the Cadillac Evening News; an editorial in the Holland Sentinel; a story by Hugh McDiarmid; a story by George Weeks; and a story by Richard Ryan.

REMARKS BY ROBERT H. MICHEL

Karen, Kara, Jordan, Megan, members of the family and friends. I speak today with a heavy heart for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are sorely grieved to lose one of our most highly respected and dearly loved members.

It's particularly sorrowful for me because PAUL's last vote was cast for me as Speaker on the opening day of the 103rd Congress.

We all had high hopes and expectations for PAUL's beating the odds because he was such a good Christian soldier.

While we mortals find it difficult to reconcile, I suspect PAUL would have had an answer for us rooted in Scripture.

One word comes to mind when I think of PAUL's contribution to our public life: That word is "Civility".

We Americans have developed a rich political vocabulary for the ugly side of public life.

How often we hear: "It's not enough to get mad; we have to get even."

But civility seems to have no similar public vocabulary.

So we might ask: what is this quiet, but vital, public virtue that was at the heart of PAUL HENRY's life?

I'd define it this way:

Civility means knowing that raising the level of your voice doesn't raise the level of the discussion.

It means recognizing that listening is a very good way of communicating.

Civility means realizing that peaks of uncommon progress can be reached by paths of common courtesy.

Civility means being tough without being mean and being principled without being fanatic.

Civility means believing in the power of reason to influence public debate, and the power of the spirit to transform private lives.

Civility is the public embodiment of the Golden Rule: "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

By those standards, PAUL HENRY was the embodiment of civility.

If I were asked to sum up PAUL's impact on those of us who knew him, I would recall a favorite phrase of my father: "Dare to be a Daniel."

By that he meant we should have the courage of Daniel in the lion's den, retaining our convictions in difficult times, trusting in Providence, doing what's right, especially when it is unpopular to do so.

PAUL HENRY dared to be a Daniel.

He dared to think through problems instead of being carried along with the crowd.

He dared to take a look at an old problem from a new angle, when others were content with mouthing slogans.

He dared to bring to bear on difficult political questions a formidable array of philosophical and religious insights, when it would be so easy to just go along and get along.

When we have truly difficult votes in the House, we say to other members: "Vote your conscience on this one."

PAUL HENRY didn't have to be told to vote his conscience; he simply didn't know any other way to vote.

For him voting one's conscience was a political as well as a moral imperative.

Three years ago, National Journal, one of the most admired and prestigious publications in America, named PAUL HENRY a "Rising Star" in Congress.

In one sense, the great tragedy for his family and friends, and for us in the Congress and the nation, is that PAUL's political star never got the opportunity to rise to its zenith.

And yet, in another sense, PAUL's star is now visible in a way none of us could have foretold.

It has arisen to a permanent place in the political firmament.

Twenty-five hundred years ago, a wise man said: "He who exercises government by means of his virtue, may be compared to the north polar star, which keeps its place, and all the stars turn toward it."

And that sums it up: PAUL HENRY always tried to exercise government by means of virtue.

And because he did, for years to come, PAUL's memory will serve as a guide and an inspiration for those who seek to improve our public life.

His star is now fixed, steady and permanent.

It's singular brightness can serve to show us all the way toward a much higher level of civility, thoughtfulness and courage as exemplified in the life and works of our dear friend PAUL HENRY.

CONGRESSMAN FRED UPTON'S EULOGY IN REMEMBRANCE OF CONGRESSMAN PAUL B. HENRY

In Chapter 2 of Timothy, PAUL tells his good friend Timothy to be faithful and learn from the way he has lived his life, saying, "I have fought the good fight, I have finished the race, I have kept the faith * * * Finally, there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness which the Lord will give me * * *"

PAUL HENRY and I were very best of friends. He was a thoughtful, honest, caring, intelligent, decent guy. He was also my mentor and confidant, who set a wonderful example for all of us in Congress. He never let Washington go to his head.

Congressmen CARL PURSELL, DAVE CAMP, PAUL, and I did almost everything together. We sat next to each other coming home to Michigan, we ate sometimes 5-6 meals a week with each other, we talked about legislative issues almost daily and cast literally thousands of votes together. I have to echo what BOB MICHEL said—PAUL HENRY WAS The Soul of our delegation, the soul of Congress.

His colleagues listened when he spoke leading debates both in committee and on the House Floor. He was a principled leader in every sense of the definition with all the respect and love one could have. Since his diagnosis, there hasn't been a single day when a handful of Members haven't stopped me to inquire about his status—even freshmen.

PAUL lived his Faith and he never lost that Faith or his wonderful sense of humor as he struggled the last several months.

PAUL was a regular at the weekly prayer breakfast. As we shared life's struggles, we developed an even stronger bond through the Bible. Our favorite verse that we both leaned on was always the 23rd Psalm. The Lord is my Shepherd * * * we'd help each other out by repeating those words. In fact, sometimes we'd just smile at each other and say 2-3.

Many of you know that PAUL's dad is a leading theologian. PAUL had a calling too—for helping others. From his service in the Peace Corps, to a Congressional Staffer, to Professor, to elected office. He deeply believed that public service indeed is a sacred trust.

PAUL never lost that perspective. As some say, once a staffer, always a staffer. No task was too small. All of his staff here and in D.C. reflected his deep caring and thoughtfulness—they were family too. When PAUL got the very rare, angry constituent phone call, it was standard practice for him to deal with it personally.

He was a tireless worker—here and in D.C. In D.C. he'd work late and come in at 7:00-7:30 a.m. PAUL's personal touch on everything confirmed to all of us that he did his homework well.

Every weekend he spent home with his family. Sundays, of course, were sacred. You'd see him here in the morning, but after that, Sundays were always KAREN & PAUL days.

Paul was known for his ability to understand an issue and work with all sides to hammer-out the winning formula that everyone knew was best. He won not with politics but with substance.

He was always viewed as a rising star. The National Journal wrote that he is the kind of person who is well-regarded even when people disagree with him.

Today there's a lot of cynicism about Congress. One of this country's leading columnists is David Broder. Broder wrote specifically last year of Paul that "he represents the other side—the unpublished side of politics and Congress. When people express their scorn for politicians and legislators, it tells me that we in the press have not done our job in depicting what the honorable men and women in those fields contribute through their service."

Those of us that want to make Congress better should look to the marker established by Paul.

In public life one has to juggle legislative priorities as well as family responsibilities. Not everyone can honestly say he or she made a difference. Paul certainly could. He stuck by his convictions and altered the lives of many still to come.

He had so many successes * * * work for the disabled; tax incentives to encourage savings for college; the National Institute of Health bill.

Paul was respected for his work on a national bottle bill and OSHA reform.

As I said earlier, Paul kept his family priorities. I can remember a birthday or anniversary that conflicted with a state GOP Convention in Detroit. Even though Paul was the odds on favorite to be the GOP front runner in the '94 Senate race—Paul's priorities were right. He spent the weekend in Chicago with his wife Karen and even took in a Cubs game.

Last fall, Paul's daughter Megan was part of the homecoming Court at a Friday night football game. Paul, who had nearly a perfect voting record, missed votes to surprise her and returned back to D.C. for votes that next day. Looking back, we're reminded that Paul has his priorities in the right place all the time.

A lot of Members bring their families to D.C. Paul kept his family home yet shared them through his values with all of us.

As I've gotten to know the family better through Paul's struggle, I know that his legacy will live on through Karen, Kara, Jordan, and Megan. As Paul had such a knack for the personal touch, I cannot believe all the love and warmth and care that this family extends to others.

We still have Paul through them and their touch shines through like a rainbow.

I was at a funeral for a good friend and what made it so sad was that none of us really had the chance to say goodbye or thank you.

Though his experience has been so tough on Paul and his family, I know that he knew how we all appreciated him through our love. The wonderful nurses, those that brought him meals every day and even added a little extra ice cream when I showed up. The carrot cakes, flowers and beautiful notes all helped him as he "walked in the shadow of death where he feared no evil" and now we know that "goodness, kindness, and mercy will follow him in the House of the Lord Forever."

The 1986 Almanac of American Politics, sometimes viewed as the Bible of Capitol Hill, summed up Paul like this, "The question is, to what use will a GOP of this

stripe—and a Jr. Member of Minority Party in the House put it to * * *

The answer can be again found in the Bible in Matthew, "Well done, good and faithful servant, well done."

Life will always be too short. When you really think about it, it doesn't take very long to live a life and Paul made the very best of his.

Because of his life, all of us have a better chance to make the very best of ours.

The country and our world is truly a better place.

HON. PAUL HENRY

(By Karen Schneider and Jean Calmen)

The commodity most prized by U.S. Representative Paul Henry, R-Mich., who died after a battle with brain cancer, was integrity.

Henry, 50, a five-term moderate Republican who had been considering a run at the U.S. Senate, had it in spades.

It meant he occasionally broke with his party or president to vote his conscience.

It meant that when he got caught up in the House bank scandal, he was anguished that it might tarnish his reputation for moral rectitude.

It meant that, at times, he became a honest broker of compromises between extreme elements in Congress.

"The word 'integrity' went hand in hand with Paul," said U.S. Rep. Frank Wolf, R-Va., who became close to Henry at weekly prayer breakfasts on Capitol Hill.

"There was not a more ethical person in Congress."

Henry's integrity combined with an analytical mind to make him a leader in hashing out issues and crafting compromises on important legislation, from state budgets in the Michigan Legislature to obscenity standards for the National Endowment for the Arts.

Born in Chicago, Henry was the son of Helga and Carl Henry, a noted theologian of modern evangelical Protestantism. He joined the Peace Corps after graduating from Wheaton College in Wheaton, Ill. serving in Ethiopia and Liberia. He also taught political science at Calvin College in Grand Rapids before beginning a career in the Michigan Legislature.

He often spoke of his faith in God, telling colleagues in an open letter this year about his struggle against cancer: "My life is in God's hands, as it always has been. My walk with Him goes on."

A member of the Christian Reformed Church, Henry drew on his faith during the most difficult of political times. During his first months in Congress in 1985, Henry was torn over whether to vote for the controversial MX missile.

The issue brought Henry's deepest convictions into conflict, recalled former Rep. Carl Pursell. Henry's support for a strong national defense clashed with his distaste for wasting taxpayers' money and his religious opposition to offensive weapons.

"We were sitting on the House steps for hours talking about that issue," said Pursell, also a moderate Michigan Republican. "It was very emotional for him."

Henry was lobbied hard by former President Gerald Ford, who once represented the same western Michigan district, and by President Ronald Reagan.

"It was pretty hard to tell Gerry Ford 'no,'" Henry confided to his good friend, Fred Upton, who joined him in the House as the Republican congressman from St. Joseph a year later.

But vote 'no' he did. He went on to help forge a compromise that reduced the number of missiles.

"He withstood mighty, mighty pressure," Upton said recently. "That vote and others set Paul apart from the go-along, get-along crowd, and established that Paul's vote was hard to get."

That kind of reasoned stance was in evidence when Henry served in the state House and Senate.

"I always knew when * * * I needed him for a vote, he was not going to be guided by politically expediency," former Gov. William Milliken said recently. "When he couldn't give his vote, he would always very candidly tell me why, and I respected that."

Henry bucked a Republican president again in 1992, when he voted to lift the ban on federally financed transplants using cells from aborted fetal tissue.

Henry was ardently opposed to abortion, but he believed that "there are aborted fetuses out there, so can you put that to good use to enhance the life of others?" recalled Doug Koopman, a former Henry staffer.

"He ticked off a lot of people," said Koopman, "but it was a mark of his openness to the other side."

The vote cost him an endorsement from Michigan Right to Life last fall.

"They took it out on Paul," Upton said. "But Paul felt in his heart that it was the right thing to do."

One of the most upsetting events in Henry's political career was the revelation in 1992 that he, like hundreds of other House members, had written some checks at the House bank without enough money to cover them.

He called a reporter into his office and pored in detail over his checkbook and bank statements to show that he was unaware at the time that he was writing bad checks.

But what tore at him were the critical news accounts and editorials in his hometown newspaper in Grand Rapids. Already slender, Henry lost weight as he agonized about the attacks on his integrity.

"Paul was just sick about it," Upton recalled.

Henry loved his work in Congress, but his strict morality also left him occasionally frustrated with the behavior of some of his colleagues. When told that another Congress member had put his hand on a female staffer's knee, Henry was shocked—though such sexual harassment was not uncommon on Capitol Hill. It was inconceivable to him that such behavior went on in Congress.

Henry was known for his advocacy of a national bottle bill, which would establish a 10-cent deposit on bottles and cans for states that don't adopt recycling programs. He served on the Education and Labor Committee, where he supported school reforms. He also pushed for ways to shore up the nation's, and his district's, manufacturing base.

Well respected for his intelligence and thoughtfulness, Henry was also very independent. "Paul did work more independently than other folks," said Koopman, his former aide.

Henry was touted as a strong potential Republican challenger to U.S. Sen. Donald Riegle Jr., who is seeking re-election next year. It was a mark of the man that when former GOP national committeeman Peter Fletcher was quoted as saying Henry would be a good candidate, Henry picked up the phone.

"He called to say he appreciated it and was flattered," Fletcher recalled.

Henry loved music, especially opera. He and his wife Karen supported the arts community in Grand Rapids. In addition to his wife, he is survived by his daughters Kara and Megan, son Jordan, and parents.

Henry was a smoker, and often fudged about how much regular exercise he was getting. But he had been in good health when, during his re-election campaign last October, he suffered memory loss and headaches. He was admitted to the hospital, and doctors removed a three-inch tumor from his brain.

He was re-elected to a fifth term 13 days later. Although he returned to Washington briefly in January and was sworn in with his colleagues, he quickly returned home to Grand Rapids.

Several days before discovering his tumor, Henry confided in Upton that he wasn't going to run for the Senate. He said that he didn't want to put his family through the stress and that he was content with his life.

"He would have made a great senator," Upton said.

[From the Detroit Free Press, Aug. 3, 1993]

COURAGE AND ACCOMPLISHMENT

Because he died at age 51, much about Paul Henry's political career must be recounted in terms of potential and promise.

But for the cancer that claimed his life last week, the Republican Congressman from Grand Rapids might well have become a formidable statewide candidate, perhaps for senator next year. In personal terms, though, Mr. Henry had long since demonstrated that he was a fulfilled man, one who knew who he was and who was beyond being defined either by his future in politics or by disease.

His civility, his intelligence, his willingness to look at each issue on its merits all marked him as a man who deserved to be and had to be taken seriously. Rep. Henry was an honest conservative, but he understood and connected with the world beyond his western Michigan district.

Mr. Henry brought to public life a rootedness and a view of the world shaped by his personal religious faith. He was sensitive to the concerns of those whose background might not be as stable and traditional as his.

That combination made him a politician with potentially broad appeal. It also made him an exceedingly engaging and impressive human being.

[From the Grand Rapids Press, Aug. 2, 1993]

PAUL HENRY: CITIZEN, FRIEND—GRAND RAPIDS AND THE COUNTRY WELL-SERVED BY THIS UNCOMMON MAN

The death of Paul Henry on Saturday surprises no one. It grieves us all. We say that not just as journalists who covered him as a public official, but as neighbors who encountered him at school meetings, at church and at countless other civic and neighborhood functions. He was a part of this community and a true representative of it.

We knew that many of you feel a similar sort of attachment. His warmth, graciousness and loyalty to the people of West Michigan were palpable. Much of that came through in a letter he wrote last April to his constituents, his last letter to them, "So many people," he said, "find themselves alone in these situations. I am truly blessed to be a part of the fair and thoughtful West Michigan community."

A measure of the community's affection and respect for him was the support given throughout his illness. This wasn't a partisan matter. Democrats and Republicans

and others of no party affiliation were willing to wait with him through this time. His years of service earned him that patience and the fervent prayers that went with it.

In his various public offices—member of the State Board of Education, state House of Representatives, state Senate and Congress—Mr. Henry was no different than the man known to his Grand Rapids neighbors and friends. He was unpretentious, far more taken with the seriousness of his work than with his own importance in doing it. And his professionalism enabled him to separate policy differences with other people from his personal feelings toward them. Campaign opponents were among his friends. They, in turn, respected him for his thorough, even scholarly, approach. And he was, in fact, an intellectual—a reasoning, inquiring person in addition to being well grounded in principle. He held a doctorate in political science and at one time taught political science at Calvin College.

On the political scale, Paul Henry was usually known as a Republican moderate but he really defied easy labeling. He picked his own way through issues, gradually changing from support of the Nicaraguan Contras, for instance, to opposition when he saw that policy failing. He was generally loyal to Republican presidents, and was like minded, though he wasn't reluctant to differ and hold his ground. Nor was he reticent about stepping into highly-charged cultural debates. Three years ago he was at the center of a raucous national controversy over federal arts funding, arguing successfully for "general standards of decency" in awarding grants and rejecting projects which "deliberately denigrate" religious, racial or ethnic groups.

On that issue, as on most others, he accurately reflected both his own opinions and those of his district. Also like his district, he held strong religious views. They motivated and defined him in his work as well as in his family life. They led him to an idealism which, in early adulthood, took him into the Peace Corps and service in Liberia and Ethiopia. At the end, through these past few months, that same faith sustained him through the frustration and darkness of brain cancer. "My life is in God's hand, as it has always been," he wrote to his colleagues in Congress. "My walk with Him goes on."

Paul Henry was 51 when he died. For the past 14 of his years, he represented the people of Grand Rapids in Lansing and Washington, always with integrity and uncommon dedication. This parting now, so premature, saddens and pains the community he loved. Because it loved him, too.

[From the Cadillac Evening News, Aug. 3, 1993]

PAUL HENRY LEAD WITH CONSCIENCE

(By Mark Lagerwey)

United States Representative Paul Henry (R-Grand Rapids) will be laid to rest today. But his political insights will live on. To that end, his life should be celebrated beyond the Third District.

Henry, a victim of brain cancer, had a refreshing political posture that should be heeded by the partisan guardians of gridlock.

The difference in Paul Henry's life was his ability to rise above partisan standards. It was, I think, a skill he had honed decades ago.

As a peripheral observer outside his district, I am not qualified to say whether Henry's propensity to avoid the political incrowd of both conservative and liberal traditions was the result of inconsistencies or jus-

tifiable convictions. As a former student of his, I can say it was probably the latter.

Professor Henry may have been at his political prime back in the early 1970's when I took his class at Calvin College. Back then, his political ambitions were still only dreams and his convictions were equally youthful and not particularly in line with the radical, 60's era.

Many classes were spent in splendid debate between long-haired students and this conservative instructor. Many discussions ended with differences unreconciled.

But, like most good arguments, the topics of these debates were soon lost. What remained was a profound sense of respect and tolerance for differing perspectives and the simple acknowledgment that ideology takes a second chair to a moral and conscientious human spirit.

One of his favorite books at that time was entitled "The End of Ideology." Henry's lectures emphasized that man is a fallen creature.

"The purpose of politics," he said at one of his classes, "isn't to bring the truth—it's a pragmatic holding pattern."

Paul Henry earned a kind of "moderate" label during the better part of five terms in Congress. His votes against MX missile funding and Reagan-era policies on Nicaragua consternated conservatives while his votes on economic policies often left liberals wanting.

Paul Henry transcended simple partisan politics and avoided ideologues. More simply, he voted his conscience. And it was a good and Christian conscience.

In discussing various Soviet theories of controlling human behavior, Henry revealed the simple flaw he saw in politics.

"They're trying to find a perfect way to determine personality," he said. "Man, however, isn't perfect. He's often inconsistent and irrational. It's the same with ideology. No one should follow a certain ideology."

It's a message that Washington could use during times when politicians are honestly hoping to end the partisanship holding legislation hostage.

Paul Henry led with compassion and conscience. And he was doing it long before his first visit to Washington.

REPRESENTATIVE HENRY—WEST MICHIGAN LOSES MAN OF INTEGRITY

Congress, the American people and his constituents are poorer for Rep. Paul Henry's death Saturday.

He was, by all accounts, the kind of elected representative every legislative body, but particularly Congress, needs more of. His constituents described him as accessible, approachable and caring.

The fact that voters last November elected him to a fifth term weeks after doctors removed a malignant tumor from his brain speaks to his abilities and his service. His death at 51, when he surely would have continued to serve his country's people so capably for many years, is a tragedy.

At a memorial service in Grand Rapids Sunday, the word "integrity" was used repeatedly to describe the late representative's life of service. Integrity is defined as the condition of being whole, complete, upright, honest and in unbroken condition. When death cuts short such a person's life the most meaningful tribute we can make is to resolve to act with greater integrity in our own lives.

That is the way it is with well-lived lives. They serve as models for the rest of us. In that way a life lived with integrity never really dies.

Paul Henry was a class act of Michigan politics, as courageous in fighting for his beliefs as in fighting for his life.

He won many of the former, and just lost the latter.

Had he not been stricken with brain cancer, fifth-term U.S. Rep. Henry, R-Grand Rapids, probably would be the current frontrunner for the Republican nomination to oppose Democratic U.S. Sen. Don Riegle.

The value of the nomination was trumpeted last week by Republican National chairman Haley Barbour, who branded Riegle "one of the most vulnerable" Democratic senators.

"Michigan is one of our best opportunities to pick up a Senate seat," Barbour said in an interview at the Grand Traverse Resort near Traverse City, where he attended a meeting of the Republican Governors' Association.

Henry, who had almost as secure a House seat in west Michigan as Democrats do in Detroit, backed off running for the Senate in the past but seemed to be gearing for a bid in 1994.

After Henry was stricken, many of those who would have supported him were encouraging U.S. Rep. Fred Upton of St. Joseph to run. Upton nearly did, but on Thursday announced that he would not—and at the same time paid tribute to Henry.

Henry had many tributes long before his death. The National Journal named him a congressional "Rising Star" in 1990.

Henry was a rarity among modern day Republicans—a moderate in an era of conservatism.

But Henry marched more to his heart than to a label when he was a lawmaker in Lansing and in Washington.

As the 1992 Almanac of American Politics put it:

"Henry has been tagged a moderate, but he has taken stands more interesting than the label. He is pro-life but spoke out against the flag-burning amendment, which he called 'a cheapening of the Constitution.' . . . A free market man on most economic issues, he voted against the 1990 budget summit package, and has pushed a national bottle deposit bill with a recycling trust fund from unclaimed deposits."

Michigan's late, great Phil Hart became known as the "conscience of the Senate." Had he lived, and stayed there, Henry might well have become the conscience of the House—which, of late, does not seem to have one.

A congressman who stood tall while the reputation of Congress sunk low.

Who will replace Henry in a seat that once was held by Gerald R. Ford—but won by Henry with greater margins than Ford ever got?

Henry had an ability to instill "the highest respect for public service," and to get people involved in the process that sustains it, according to Grand Rapids attorney Richard F. Vander Veen III.

Vander Veen, whose father once held the seat, is among the Democrats being mentioned as a contender to seek the seat that Henry filled with such dedication, compassion and distinction.

POLITICS

(By Hugh McDiarmid)

The stories about the death of U.S. Rep. Paul Henry of Grand Rapids are full of well-deserved praise for his probity and principled, straight-arrow approach to politics and government. Many suggest that, had he not been done in at age 51 by a brain tumor, he would have been a favorite for the Republican U.S. Senate nomination in 1994.

All true.

Many of them also mention that he was widely known as a Republican "moderate," a term that, in Henry's case, is worth further exploration.

That's because, among Michigan Republicans in recent years, the "moderate" label and politicians, such as Henry, who wear it proudly have become suspect as outsiders and, in some party circles, as objects of derision.

The 1980 presidential election year was something of a watershed for him.

Seeking a second term in the Michigan House, Henry not only signed on with the quixotic presidential campaign of liberal U.S. Rep. John Anderson, then an Illinois Republican (for whom he'd worked years earlier in Washington), but agreed to be Anderson's Michigan chairman. And when, early on, Anderson defected from the GOP, preferring to run as an independent, Henry bowed out to support George Bush, but reluctantly and with this cool explanation: "There is such a thing as institutional obligation. . . . It's sometimes difficult, but I have chosen to be a Republican, and I'll remain one."

Then in 1984, despite being an all-but-announced congressional candidate in a fairly conservative, Grand Rapids district and despite the GOP's Reagan-inspired plunge to the conservative right, he agreed to be the keynote speaker at a gathering in Lansing of the Michigan Moderate Republican Conference.

That group was a melange of disaffected, Bill Milliken-era GOPers, many of whom were openly hostile to President Ronald Reagan and some of whom were involved in distinctly non-GOP agendas—pro-choice, equal rights for women, a "big-tent" approach to civil rights and minorities, environmentalism, etc.

Yet Henry saw it as an opportunity and urged then-GOP state Chairman Spencer Abraham and others to get involved with the moderates.

"It was my feeling that we should not let the gap continue to grow", he explained later. "There is a danger in leaving people out."

He also said this: "There is a role for ideologues of both the right and left because they raise the issues. But when it comes to resolving the issues, moderation prevails."

Hmm! Anyway, the party ignored him and the GOP moderates drifted off. Henry went on to Congress to become . . . well, GOP leaders respected his intellect and his probity, but he was not always a team player.

For example, his "no" vote (the only one from a Michigan Republican) in March 1985 on MX missile funding—despite an Oval Office lobbying effort by Reagan—enraged them.

In Michigan, the board of the Michigan Conservative Union condemned him and sponsored a noisy (but unsuccessful) effort to have him censured by the GOP State Committee.

There were subsequent votes in Congress—in support of designating Michigan wilderness areas, in support of fetal tissue research, etc.—that cut against the grain of GOP orthodoxy and in which Henry demonstrated an independence that marked him as something of an outsider politically.

But he was always a thoughtful, responsible outsider . . . or moderate or independent . . . or whatever people preferred to label him.

That's what distinguished him from many of his colleagues, and it's what earned him so much respect.

Anyway, there seem to be fewer and fewer Paul Henrys around any more, certainly not in today's Republican Party. And that's a shame.

[From the Detroit News, Aug. 1, 1993]

TRIBUTES POUR IN FOR PAUL HENRY

(By Richard A. Ryan)

WASHINGTON.—Rep. Paul Henry was remembered Saturday as a professorial lawmaker whose thoughtful approach to issues earned him a reputation for conscience and integrity.

The soft-spoken Henry, 51, who served eight years in Congress in the seat once held by former President Gerald Ford, died of brain cancer at 3:25 a.m. Saturday in his Grand Rapids home. He had been ill since undergoing surgery last October.

Republicans and Democrats alike mourned their colleague, an ex-college professor who took his duties seriously.

"He was a very decent, honest, honorable and capable individual who worked very hard," said Rep. John Dingell, D-Trenton, the dean of Michigan's congressional delegation. "He was well liked by everyone."

"If there were more Paul Henrys here in the Congress, we could get things done rather than sitting around shouting at one another," said Rep. Dale Kildee, D-Flint, who served with Henry on the House Education and Labor Committee. "He really wanted to accomplish things for this country. He will be sorely missed."

Chuck Yob, a Republican national committeeman from Grand Rapids, said Henry "was a straightforward, honest guy and in politics, I hate to say it, that is not always the rule. He had all of the things we pray for every day in an elected official."

Henry, R-Grand Rapids, was running for re-election to a fifth term last fall when he experienced severe headaches. Examination revealed the cancer and in an operation Oct. 21, doctors removed a 3-inch tumor from the right frontal lobe of his brain. The cancer was diagnosed as glioblastoma multiforme, one of the most malignant varieties with an average survival rate of about one year.

Henry easily won re-election to a fifth term two weeks after the surgery, defeating Carol Kooistra with 63 percent of the vote.

After the operation Henry made two appearances in public. Last Thanksgiving Day, following a tradition started in 1984, Henry read the president's annual Thanksgiving proclamation at the Mayflower Congregational Church in Grand Rapids. Henry, whose father is Carl Henry, the noted Christian theologian who founded the magazine "Christianity Today," was deeply religious.

He was a member of the Dutch Reformed Church.

Last January, Henry flew to Washington to take the oath of office. In an emotional scene, Henry—by then in a wheelchair—was surrounded by his friends and colleagues as he was sworn in by House Speaker Tom Foley.

"He was a Republican in the mold of Arthur Vandenberg and Jerry Ford," said U.S. Sen. Carl Levin, D-Mich. "He was an ideal public servant."

In April, Henry took out an advertisement in Roll Call, a newspaper circulated on Capitol Hill, in which he proclaimed his determination to "return to the fray" in Congress.

"My life is in God's hands, as it always has been," Henry said in the ad. "My walk with Him goes on." But in mid-May Henry's aides admitted for the first time that it was not likely he would return to Washington.

"We had all been hoping for a miracle," Republican Gov. Jon Engler said in a statement Saturday.

Henry is survived by his wife, Karen, a former concert pianist, and three children, Kara, Jordan, and Megan.

On Saturday, President Bill Clinton said: "It's tragic when such a productive and promising life is cut short much before its time. His personal courage and bravery will be an inspiration to us."

Henry was born in Chicago and received his undergraduate degree at Wheaton College in Illinois and his master's and doctorate degrees from Duke University. After a stint as a Peace Corps volunteer in Ethiopia and Liberia, Henry taught political science at Duke and later Calvin College in Grand Rapids.

Henry was elected to the Michigan House of Representatives in 1978 and spent four years in the House and two years in the state Senate before being elected to Congress. He defeated Keary Sawyer, the son of ex-Rep. Harold Sawyer, in a hard-fought Republican primary and had not faced a serious challenge since.

He was considering running against Democratic Sen. Donald Riegle in 1994 before being stricken.

Gary Lytle, a longtime lobbyist for Michigan Bell Telephone Co. who now lobbies for Ameritech, called Henry "a helluva guy."

"I have been doing this for 10 years," Lytle said, "and of all the members I've ever called on, he was absolutely one of the nicest, most honest, most decent guys I've ever dealt with. I think Grand Rapids and Michigan have suffered quite a loss."

As a congressman, Henry was hard to label. He was generally conservative, but with an independent streak, even though his Grand Rapids district is considered one of the nation's most conservative.

In his first year in Congress, Henry defied President Reagan and voted against building the MX missile and providing assistance to the Nicaraguan contras. His actions prompted a few Michigan Republicans to attempt to censure him for "hostile behavior."

He opposed President Bush and voted for such issues as fetal tissue research and extending benefits to the long-term unemployed.

"I'm a fiscal conservative," he said once, "but not a Scrooge."

Henry fought unsuccessfully in Congress for passage of a national bottle bill that would require deposits on bottles and cans similar to the Michigan law. His environmental efforts won him the endorsement of the Sierra Club in his re-election campaign last year.

He was viewed by his colleagues as a voice of reason in the squabble over funding of the National Endowment for the Arts. He opposed funding what he considered to be pornographic or blasphemous art, but neither did he want to put the government in the position of being a censor.

Rep. Frank Wolf, R-Va., said that Henry's thoughtfulness and care in deciding issues helped influence the decisions of others.

"He was the type of person that for a number of us you would want to see how Paul Henry was voting," Wolf said. "I found his advice and judgment to be very, very sound."

Madam Speaker, PAUL and I had a very special relationship and a very special friendship. He served his constituents very well. He traveled home nearly every weekend. He paid close personal attention to all of his mail. And we talked and conferred on lit-

erally hundreds of votes cast in this Chamber.

As it has been said many times this evening, when Paul spoke on issues on this floor, people on both sides of the center aisle listened, and his arguments in support of or against an issue were substantive. They were based on the merits, not on the politics.

He was not afraid to look a Republican President in the eye and say no; and, consequently, when he said yes, folks in both parties knew that his convictions were strong.

I could easily fill the night with the many, many stories of our relationship, the two of us. Some of them were serious; obviously some of them were not. But he was viewed by everyone as very conscientious, effective, hard-working, thoughtful, and caring. He believed very strongly that public service indeed was a sacred trust.

All through his life PAUL focused on helping others, whether it be in the Peace Corps, as a congressional staffer, as a state legislator, or, later, as a Member of Congress.

On his last day in the chamber when he was sworn in, Jim Ford, who is on the floor tonight, the Pastor of the House, talked to PAUL with regard to his brain cancer and related the story that the word was out that only about 5 percent of those that had this particular type of cancer were able to survive a year. And as Jim and PAUL talked, PAUL said, "Jim, we are all a child of God."

PAUL had a great sense of humor. He had many practical jokes that he played on people on both sides of the aisle. A particular story that I remember involved a Member of our Michigan delegation, DALE KILDEE. Both DALE and PAUL had a spotless record in terms of voting. I do not think either one of them really had missed a vote in the last decade.

I can remember racing off to the airport after a vote, bounding down the stairs, as SANDY LEVIN was relating, trying to catch our car and catch a plane that left literally in 12 minutes from National Airport. And as we got onto the plane, tired, on a hot summer day, DALE KILDEE was in the seat across the aisle, and PAUL and I played a little joke on DALE.

We said, "Boy, when that little beeper went off when we got across the 14th Street Bridge, did you make it back to cast the vote to adjourn?"

Well, we did not have a vote to adjourn that night or that afternoon. But DALE just about died. And all the way to Dayton, where we changed planes and went our ways, to Grand Rapids, South Bend, or Detroit, DALE was worried that he had missed a vote, the first one in a long, long time.

□ 2020

As folks across this country listen to this special order, I would like to re-

flect for a moment on a lesson that many of us learned through PAUL's struggle: How many times is it when we might lose a friend and we wonder why we did not give them an extra pat on the back or a hello, or were we too busy, had we not wished that we had said something?

Well, we learned with PAUL, we really did, and it was marvelous.

As I would travel to his house and hold his hand, to see the volumes of letters, not only from Members of Congress, but his constituents and people around the country who wrote praising his work. And I know that that outpouring of love was appreciated deeply by PAUL. Not a day would go by when Members in this House on both sides of the aisle would not stop and ask how their dear friend PAUL was doing. And that gave him strength; it really did.

In fact, near the end of his life, he took out a letter and wrote this:

"On my desk at home in Michigan, I keep a very special album. Its pages contain the scores of cards and letters you have sent to me during my battle with cancer. You will never know just how uplifting your kindness and support have been to me and my family. I count as one of God's great blessings the opportunity I have to serve so many fine people. Caring and thoughtfulness and hope knows no political party. Please note that despite the frustrations of continuing my recovery at home, I remain determined to return to the fray on Capitol Hill. My family and I have grown through this struggle. We face our challenges together each day. God has not taken us out of the storm but he is leading us through it. Your letters, your encouragement, your humor and my great staff members"—and they were great, still are—"who keep my offices running smoothly are so important along the way. My life is in God's hands, as it has always been. My walk with him goes on."

That is PAUL. That really was.

Last fall our Michigan delegation held a celebration honoring our esteemed retiring Members of Congress. For this event, all of us in the delegation recorded our thoughts on tape that was given to those retiring Members.

Thinking of PAUL, I pulled out that tape and watched a little bit of it again today.

On it, a buoyant PAUL HENRY, with a smile and enthusiasm we will always miss, says words which have a special significance today. He says this:

"It is unfortunate that the public sees politics so often only in terms of combat and political hyperbole and is unaware of the fact that generally we work very closely together and very strong friendships have bound us together. I am sure that these friendships will continue to grow over the years."

It was just a few weeks later, after we did that special order, that PAUL,

who appeared so full of life, was diagnosed with this terrible brain cancer. It is still hard to believe.

Today, I know I speak for all of us when I say that his death has left us all with a tremendous amount of sadness. Yet, it is also true that his life and the way that he lived it has left us all with a tremendous amount of hope. If he could keep his faith in the face of such pain and adversity, then certainly, as we deal with our daily struggles, so can we.

PAUL's example of fighting the good fight and keeping his faith, of keeping his concern for others with that marvelous sense of humor, despite his own suffering, is a lesson and a legacy to us all.

Mr. MICHEL. Madam Speaker, I am honored to be part of the tribute for Congressman PAUL HENRY. Obviously the loss of such a talented colleague and a wonderful person like PAUL has deeply moved all of us. It was my privilege and a great honor to have said a few words in honor of PAUL at a ceremony of remembrance in Grand Rapids. At this time I would like to insert the eulogy I gave for PAUL HENRY on August 3, 1993.

EULOGY FOR PAUL HENRY

(Remarks by Robert H. Michel)

Karen, Kara, Jordan, Megan, members of the family and friends. I speak today with a heavy heart for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are sorely grieved to lose one of our most highly respected and dearly loved members.

It's particularly sorrowful for me because PAUL's last vote was cast for me as Speaker on the opening day of the 103rd Congress.

We all had high hopes and expectations for Paul's beating the odds because he was such a good Christian soldier.

While we mortals find it difficult to reconcile, I suspect PAUL would have had an answer for us rooted in Scripture.

One word comes to mind when I think of PAUL's contribution to our public life: That word is "Civility."

We Americans have developed a rich political vocabulary for the ugly side of public life.

How often we hear: "It's not enough to get mad; we have to get even."

But civility seems to have no similar public vocabulary.

So we might ask: what is this quiet, but vital, public virtue that was at the heart of PAUL HENRY's life?

I'd define it this way:

Civility means knowing that raising the level of your voice doesn't raise the level of the discussion.

It means recognizing that listening is a very good way of communicating.

Civility means realizing that peaks of uncommon progress can be reached by paths of common courtesy.

Civility means being tough without being mean and being principled without being fanatic.

Civility means believing in the power of reason to influence public debate, and the power of the spirit to transform private lives.

Civility is the public embodiment of the Golden Rule: "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

By those standards, PAUL HENRY was the embodiment of civility.

If I were asked to sum up PAUL's impact on those of us who knew him, I would recall a favorite phrase of my father: "Dare to be a Daniel."

By that he meant we should have the courage of Daniel in the lion's den, retaining our convictions in difficult times, trusting in Providence, doing what's right, especially when it is unpopular to do so.

PAUL HENRY dared to be a Daniel.

He dared to think through problems instead of being carried along with the crowd.

He dared to take a look at an old problem from a new angle, when others were content with mouthing slogans.

He dared to bring to bear on difficult political questions a formidable array of philosophical and religious insights, when it would be so easy to just go along and get along.

When we have truly difficult votes in the House, we say to other members: "Vote your conscience on this one."

PAUL HENRY didn't have to be told to vote his conscience; he simply didn't know any other way to vote.

For him voting one's conscience was a political as well as a moral imperative.

Three years ago, National Journal, one of the most admired and prestigious publications in America, named PAUL HENRY a "Rising Star" in Congress.

In one sense, the great tragedy for his family and friends, and for us in the Congress and the Nation, is that PAUL's political star never got the opportunity to rise to its zenith.

And yet, in another sense, PAUL's star is now visible in a way none of us could have foretold.

It has arisen to a permanent place in the political firmament.

Twenty-five hundred years ago, a wise man said: "He who exercises government by means of his virtue, may be compared to the north polar star, which keeps its place, and all the stars turn toward it."

And that sums it up: PAUL HENRY always tried to exercise government by means of virtue.

And because he did, for years to come, PAUL's memory will serve as a guide and an inspiration for those who seek to improve our public life.

His star is now fixed, steady and permanent.

It's singular brightness can serve to show us all the way toward a much higher level of civility, thoughtfulness and courage as exemplified in the life and works of our dear friend PAUL HENRY.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, it is a sad duty to rise in tribute to our departed colleague, the late PAUL B. HENRY of the Third Congressional District of the State of Michigan.

Although we all knew that PAUL has been ill for some time, his passing nonetheless shocks and saddens all of us. PAUL was one of those Members of Congress who brightened this Chamber and made our tasks and toils more pleasant because of his reasonableness and his ability to bring us together on many issues. PAUL was singularly gifted in that he had the unique ability of respecting and soliciting other opinions and views on a variety of issues, while never wavering from his own firm convictions and from the high standards which were the hallmark of his career and his life. PAUL HENRY will long be remembered in this Chamber due to his impeccable integrity.

PAUL had been a Member of Congress since 1984, but even before his first election

he had been highly touted as an eventual candidate for the other Chamber or for the governorship of his home State of Michigan. Back in 1990, the National Journal labeled PAUL HENRY one of the young "rising stars" in the Congress, and no one in this Chamber disputed that assessment.

PAUL HENRY's contributions to this body were legendary and immeasurable. As a veteran of Peace Corps service, PAUL brought to the House humanity and compassion, which the insight of service abroad with that organization instilled in him. As a former professor at Duke University and Calvin College, as well as a former member of his school board at home, PAUL reminded us all that an investment in the young of our Nation is the most worthwhile investment we can make, because it is an investment in the future of our cherished way of life.

As a former Member of both houses of the Michigan State Legislature, PAUL brought to the Congress experience and expertise in the art of legislating and in the practice of compromise and parliamentary procedure. As a devoted husband and father, PAUL reminded us all of the family values which have made our civilization thrive throughout the centuries.

Congressman PAUL B. HENRY was only 51 years young at the time of his most untimely passing, but his legacy in this Chamber and in his Third District of Michigan will not soon be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I join with our colleagues in expressing sincerest condolences to his wife Karen Anne, to his daughters Kara and Megan, to his son Jordan, and to his many other relatives, friends, and loved ones. Our expressions of sorrow may be of small comfort to them, but perhaps the knowledge that many of us share their grief will help ease their irreplaceable loss.

Mr. HASTERT. Madam Speaker, I join today with other Members of the House to pay tribute to a dear friend and colleague who passed away on July 31, Congressman PAUL HENRY of Grand Rapids, MI.

Those of us on Capitol Hill will remember PAUL as an able, dedicated Member of this body who served his constituents well over the last 9 years of his life. I can add that I knew PAUL 30 years ago, when we both were undergraduates at Wheaton College in Wheaton, IL, and I can truly say that his spirit and dedication to improving the human condition were lifelong attributes.

PAUL graduated from Wheaton College a year before I did, in 1963, and followed his studies by volunteering for 2 years in the Peace Corps. PAUL spent those 2 years in Liberia and Ethiopia, joining in that great American effort to bring hope and a new beginning to those less fortunate. Those of us who knew him would not be surprised at that decision; that is the kind of man PAUL was.

As a teacher and a legislator, who served in both the Michigan State house and senate before coming to Washington, PAUL showed us time and time again that a life of public service is a truly noble cause—and one that is not to be taken lightly.

He will be missed. PAUL HENRY will be missed in this House, where we will no longer have the benefit of his knowledge and energy. I will miss PAUL because I have lost a colleague that I was proud to call my friend.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, on this most sullen of occasions, we come today to honor one of our fellow Congressmen, PAUL HENRY. Although Representative HENRY and I sat on opposite sides of the aisle, I respected and admired this fellow Michigander and most honorable statesman.

Congressman HENRY's many years of public service, both in the Michigan State Legislature and in the U.S. House of Representatives, exemplified his dedication to his constituency, his commitment to public service, and to those causes in which he believed strongly.

Whether it was fighting for the taxpayer against wasteful Government spending when he won the "Bulldog of the Treasury Award," or when he was delivering constituent services to the people of western Michigan, PAUL HENRY served in this Congress with the utmost dignity, honor, and modesty.

PAUL was dedicated to the citizens of western Michigan. He had a reputation for getting out into the community and listening to his constituents, and understanding their needs and concerns. People in the Grand Rapids area will certainly miss the personable and thoughtful Congressman that they found in PAUL HENRY.

But most importantly, PAUL HENRY's strong Christian faith and his rich family life helped him and his family through these most trying of times. PAUL will be missed by many.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to pay tribute to our colleague, the late PAUL HENRY of Michigan. I do so with great sadness that a life so useful and so promising has been cut short, but also with gratitude for the privilege of knowing PAUL and for the contribution he made to this House and to our country's public life.

PAUL had strong ties to my State of North Carolina. He and his wife Karen lived in Durham in the late 1960's while PAUL was pursuing his doctorate in political science at Duke University. They have continued to visit our State and have many friends there.

PAUL and I pursued similar academic courses. We finished our graduate work at about the same time, and I came to Duke to teach political science shortly after he left to assume a faculty appointment at Calvin College. His main academic interest was in political philosophy, but he had strong practical and policy interests as well. He was drawn to the political arena, and in 1979, after 8 years of teaching, was first elected to the Michigan State house.

PAUL was a man of deep religious faith and reflection. He grew up in a family steeped in biblical learning and theological discussion, and he sought constructively to relate his faith to the challenges of public life, both in his scholarly work and in his personal career. His was a deeply rooted faith, but always, in Augustine's phrase, a "faith seeking understanding." He was a source of inspiration and insight to many of us here.

I felt a special kinship to PAUL because of the similarity of our backgrounds and interests. We have arrived at somewhat different points politically and philosophically, although not as different as our respective party labels would suggest. And I feel considerable regret—the kind of regret we feel most acutely when a

friend and colleague departs prematurely—that the pressures and preoccupations of our life here prevented me from spending more time with him.

But whether one knew PAUL HENRY well or simply observed the way he conducted his life and work, there was universal admiration for him in this body. I have seldom heard more sincere tributes than those delivered by Mr. MICHEL, Mr. UPTON, and others at the moving and majestic memorial service in Grand Rapids—tributes to which PAUL's colleagues there assembled said a silent "Amen." We are all better for having known him, just as the House of Representatives and our country have been blessed and enriched by his faithful service.

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join those paying tribute to one of the truly extraordinary individuals who has served in this body in recent years, PAUL HENRY.

My singular regret is that, having come to the House of Representatives only after his illness, I missed the opportunity to work with a man who, by all accounts, represented the very best in public service and in a commitment to our country.

PAUL HENRY was known for his fairness, his intellect, and his compassion. He took a centrist approach on social issues and a free market stance on economic ones. "The Almanac of American Politics" described him in this way: "In the House, HENRY has been tagged as a moderate, but has taken stands more interesting than the label." And he said of himself, "I'm a fiscal conservative, but not a scrooge."

A former Peace Corps volunteer, PAUL HENRY began his career in Washington as a legislative assistant to Representative John Anderson. He then taught political science at Duke University and Calvin College and served in the Michigan State Legislature before being elected to the House in 1984. Named a "Rising Star" in Congress by National Journal in 1990, PAUL HENRY will be deeply missed by all who have known him—and also be those of us who, while not having the honor to know him personally, know of his many contributions on behalf of his fellow citizens.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Madam Speaker, earlier today, I returned from a weekend trip to Wisconsin. As I arrived at National Airport, I carried my bags to the congressional parking lot, got into my car, and drove to the Capitol. Nothing is unusual about any of this—except for one thing. For the past decade, it has become custom as I'd drive in or out of that parking lot to see a car with the candy-bar bumper strip. That "Oh-Henry" bumper strip said so much to me about our late dear friend and colleague, PAUL HENRY.

PAUL HENRY represented everything that is good and wholesome about our country. His Midwestern roots showcased his satisfaction with the basics of life. There was nothing flamboyant or artificial about PAUL HENRY. There were no surprises or disappointments. But there was everything reliable and good—in a sense just like that candy-bar logo he used. In PAUL HENRY, what you see—is what you get. We all liked that very much. And the Congress today would have a whole lot better reputation if there were more "Paul Henry's".

For the past decade, I had the personal privilege of serving in Congress with PAUL. We

considered ourselves "governing Republicans" and thus political soulmates. We were seat mates on the Republican side of the Education and Labor Committee. And we considered each other a personal friend.

Everyone knows of PAUL's deep religious faith and his keen intellect. I came to admire this often. But at no time did he use the strength of these two pillars better than during the reauthorization of the National Endowment for the Arts. As members of the Education and Labor Committee, with jurisdiction over the Endowment, we were both deeply committed to finding a solution to the controversies surrounding this agency. It would have been easy to walk away from this fight; vote against reauthorization, and make easy and cheap political points. But PAUL was not that kind of legislator.

While I worked on the simple issue of grant reform, PAUL HENRY took on the almost impossible task of defining pornography as it pertained to this agency. To recognize the conflicts of church vs. state; artist vs. taxpayer; and constitutional rights vs. public interest, is no easy challenge. But I would suggest that the National Endowment for the Arts is a viable agency today because PAUL HENRY spent time in the Chamber.

More recently PAUL served as the ranking Republican on the OSHA Subcommittee. As organized labor made a valiant effort last session to pass new legislation, PAUL HENRY provided the leadership expected from his type of legislator. First, he spent countless hours on the subject mastering the issues. Second, he spent considerable time meeting with groups on both sides of the issue seeking input, information, and possible consensus. When it became clear that labor and he would not agree—he took what seemed to him the next logical step. He didn't just oppose their bill. Rather, he laboriously developed his own alternative in the true "PAUL HENRY" style. He sought positive and voluntary ways to achieve the same goals of worker protection. Yet, he recognized the need for a strong Government response to intentional and callous abusers. He was committed to the philosophy that encouraged faith in the responsibility of our citizens. Yet, he was willing to use the force of Government when necessary. There is no doubt in my mind that the PAUL HENRY substitute prevented Congress from passing a bad piece of legislation too quickly. If we are now successful, in passing a bipartisan reform bill in this Congress, we all have only PAUL HENRY to thank.

These are just two of the many examples of PAUL HENRY's mark on this Congress and the country. I could literally go over almost every issue before our committee and recall a similar positive contribution from PAUL HENRY. PAUL was loyal, honest, and always a man of his word. One could always depend on him and look forward to working with him on an issue. You knew that PAUL would do his homework, and proceed in a constructive manner.

For me, one of the most pleasant memories was our many personal conversations. These went beyond the mundane issues of the day. Each summer PAUL and his family took a trip through my district. And each summer PAUL would stop in my hometown. First, he would

go into my local campaign office to tell the campaign workers how much he enjoyed working with me. Then he would go to the Norske Nook Cafe, my hometown's popular and famous restaurant known for its home-made pies. This was PAUL HENRY—enjoying the best of life's basics. And while he did it, he always found time for a nice word about a friend.

This summer, we missed PAUL in Osseo and at the Norske Nook. This year we have missed PAUL here in Congress and at the Education and Labor Committee. Yet we have all been blessed and touched by PAUL HENRY—who he was to us personally, and what he stood for professionally. To his family we say today, as we did at PAUL's funeral in Grand Rapids earlier this summer. "Thank you for sharing PAUL with us. We are better for it as individuals, as a Congress, and as a Nation."

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I would like to express my sincere grief over the passing of my friend and colleague, Congressman PAUL B. HENRY.

As a member of the Michigan delegation and from his dedicated service to the Education and Labor Committee, I knew and respected PAUL as a man of exceptional honesty, integrity and character. In Michigan politics he was a Republican in the tradition of former Gov. William Milliken and not the more strident current Governor.

While we sometimes disagreed on issues that came before the Education and Labor Committee, his basic respect for the dignity of the individual made it possible for us to work together to enact civil rights laws such as the Civil Rights Restoration Act and the Americans With Disabilities Act. He supported the Civil Rights Restoration Act over the vetoes of both President Reagan and President Bush.

Even where we strongly disagreed, as we did on issues such as occupational health and safety, PAUL HENRY's basic integrity made him a constructive critic, who made proposals that allowed the opportunity for dialog and co-operation. For example, as the ranking minority member of the Health and Safety Subcommittee, he proposed legislation in 1990 that would have expanded the right of employees to know the types of hazardous substances in their workplaces.

His service in the Peace Corps from 1963 to 1965 is an early indication of his commitment to helping people and the world we live in. This commitment continued in his political career as both a State Representative and a State Senator prior to his election in 1984 as the U.S. Representative for Michigan's fifth district.

As a member of the Christian Reformed Church, religion played a meaningful role in his life and his strong faith guided his work. He always placed an important emphasis on family. He is survived by his loving wife, Karen, and their three children. They have suffered with him through his long and painful illness. I extend to them my deepest sympathy.

PAUL HENRY has had a significant impact on this body and on our country. He was a distinguished and well-respected Member of Congress and will be genuinely missed by all who had the pleasure and honor of knowing and working with him.

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, the death of our colleague PAUL HENRY, is a profound loss for the Congress, the citizens of Michigan, and our entire Nation. One of America's most respected and promising leaders has been taken from us much too soon, and together with PAUL's family, we are shaken and deeply saddened.

PAUL was once described as combining "the conservative instincts of an evangelical Christian, the open mind of a former Peace Corps volunteer, and the intellectual approach of a political scientist." This is an unusual mix of traits, but then, PAUL HENRY was an unusually gifted and engaging man.

PAUL was someone who valued careful deliberation and consensus above rhetorical flourishes and partisanship. His integrity and sound judgment helped guide many debates in this House toward resolution, and he held his office as a sacred trust. As our distinguished Republican leader said at yesterday's service, "PAUL HENRY didn't have to be told to vote his conscience. He didn't know any other way to vote."

Throughout his service in public office, PAUL distinguished himself as a hard-working legislator, and in every chamber of which he was a member—the Michigan House and Senate and then this body—he gained the respect, admiration, and friendship of Members on both sides of the aisle. PAUL was one of those rare elected officials who had what the pundits call "reach"—the ability to understand other points of view and to make connections and alliances with people across the political spectrum. This is why Mr. UPTON, PAUL's Michigan colleague and close friend, referred to him yesterday as "the soul of Congress."

But most of all, we will miss PAUL's delightful friendship and his warm personality. He never allowed the cancer which he was fighting to beat back his bright spirit or his sense of humor. One recent press account captured this well, relating this comment that PAUL made to a nurse who was helping him roll over in bed: "I'm a Republican * * * I do better on the right side."

Madam Speaker, in his all too short life, PAUL HENRY contributed great intelligence and compassion to the public policy debates in this country, and we will long cherish his memory. He showed us all what distinguished public service really means.

I join my colleagues in expressing deepest condolences to PAUL's wife, Karen, and his three children, Kara, Jordan and Megan. All Americans share in your great loss, and our thoughts and prayers are with you.

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to pay a special tribute to our colleague PAUL HENRY. PAUL was a friend to all and well respected by colleagues on both sides of the aisle. PAUL was considered a rising star in the House and served his country, and his constituents with distinction.

I first met PAUL in my freshman year during our tenure together on the House Education and Labor Subcommittee on Health and Safety. As the only two Republican members of the subcommittee, PAUL offered a guiding hand and helped me learn the in's and out's of Congress, as well as the laws affecting health and safety in the workplace. His leadership in the area of occupational safety and

health was well known and will be especially missed this year as the Education and Labor Committee grapples with this difficult issue.

I would like to share one particularly fond memory of PAUL. The Subcommittee on Health and Safety was in charge of the Mine Safety and Health Act [MSHA]. PAUL thought it only proper that we go down into a coal mine to see for ourselves what it was like. Before our trip, we both agreed that coal miners had difficult jobs. After several hours in the mine, we agreed even more. I still have the picture of PAUL and myself in our coal miners outfits, headlamps and all—quite a sight.

PAUL HENRY will surely be missed in Congress and I wish to offer my deepest condolences to his wife, Anne, and his three children.

Mr. ZELIFF. Madam Speaker, I was deeply saddened when I learned of the passing of our colleague, PAUL HENRY. This institution lost one of its most respected and honorable Members, and in these turbulent times, that loss is even more magnified.

I knew PAUL since I was elected in 1990, and had the opportunity to serve with him in the Republican whip organization. For me and the rest of this year's sophomore class, he served as a true role model. He was always there to offer advice and to lend a helping hand. In addition, PAUL was a distinguished man who had the integrity and charisma to be respected on both sides of the aisle.

His ability to demand respect from so many different people was a tribute to what he could have accomplished if he hadn't been taken from us so early. All of his qualities ensured him a spot high not only within the Republican party, but in national politics. He had a lot to offer this country, and a lot to offer those of us he left behind. It is my hope that my colleagues will join me in working to continue his spirit of cooperation among all people, and to continue working toward a better future for our country.

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our courageous colleague, Congressman PAUL HENRY, who passed away in July at the age of 50 after a 10-month battle with brain cancer.

It is difficult to know where to begin in talking about PAUL's attributes; professionally, he was a brilliant former political science professor who was one of the Republican Party's rising stars; personally, he was a soft-spoken, thoughtful, always considerate friend who cared deeply about people.

PAUL had forged a distinguished career even before he was elected to represent Michigan's Third District in the House in 1983. Holder of a Ph.D. from Duke, PAUL served in the Peace Corps, taught at Calvin College, and worked as an aide to Illinois Congressman John Anderson before his election to the State House and State Senate.

In Congress, he was best known for his work on the Education and Labor Committee, where he became the ranking member of the Human Resources Committee earlier this year. His encyclopedic interests on the committee included OSHA and college funding issues.

I worked most closely with PAUL on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, where he focused on technology issues, especially those dealing with manufacturing. On a

personal level, PAUL's incisive questioning at a hearing proved of great assistance as I re-crafted provisions of legislation I developed on computer software. At his death, PAUL was the ranking member of the Committee's Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight.

Thanks in part to his many committee-related initiatives, PAUL was quickly—and justifiably—cited by many—including the *National Journal* and columnist David Broder—as one of the Republicans' stars for the future. He was viewed as a certain candidate for the Senate in the near future.

How tragic to have the life of this great man snuffed out at the age of 50. We can find some consolation in the fact that he carved out a big legacy in Congress over the past decade, a legacy that will not soon be forgotten.

My thoughts go out at this time to PAUL's widow, Karen, and to their three children.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in remembering PAUL HENRY.

Everyone who had the opportunity to serve with PAUL in this House knows that he was one of the most fair, thoughtful, and respected Members of Congress.

As his constituents knew, he always represented his district with integrity and dedication.

This House, Grand Rapids, and the country lost one of the most admired and honest men in public service when PAUL passed away. We can take but small comfort in the knowledge that his suffering has come to an end and he is now in Heaven watching over all of us.

As one who considered PAUL a role model as a new Member of Congress, and still to this day, I mourn his passing and wish to convey my deepest thoughts and prayers to his family.

Mr. QUILLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight with a heavy heart to pay a most deserving tribute to our late dear friend and esteemed colleague from Michigan, PAUL HENRY, who was taken from us July 31st.

PAUL came here to Congress in 1985 after a distinguished career of service in the Peace Corps, as a college professor, and as a State legislator. He was elected by the people of a district that know men of integrity when they see them, for PAUL held the seat in the House formerly held by such notables as Senator Arthur Vandenberg and President Jerry Ford.

Upon his arrival, he sought those assignments and duties that would allow him to do the most good for the most people. A man of unshakable religious faith, PAUL HENRY always sought to apply his Christian principles to the legislative process. When those principles conflicted with party politics or political ideology, PAUL would always place his beliefs first, and I admired him for it. He strove tirelessly to represent the best interests of his constituents and the Nation.

Madam Speaker, a cruel illness has robbed us of a man of faith, integrity, compassion, and seemingly limitless potential. I join my colleagues in remembering PAUL and in sending our sincere condolences to his widow and children. We can only wonder what PAUL's future would have held, had cancer not stricken him down, but we know that this country is better off because of PAUL HENRY's service to it.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to a Member of this body that all of us will truly miss. When we lost PAUL HENRY to his battle with cancer, we lost not only a fellow colleague, but also a true friend.

So much has been said in recent days about our friend, that I find it difficult to offer more to the gracious words already spoken. I met PAUL shortly after he was first elected in 1984 and enjoyed the distinct privilege of serving with him on the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee. I quickly learned to appreciate PAUL's skills and abilities as a legislator coupled with his sincerity and fair treatment of those around him.

Congress' reputation has suffered in recent months, but PAUL HENRY always stood as a beacon of integrity in this institution. He was an integral part of the Republican party and well respected by Members on both sides of the aisle. Although we can no longer take advantage of his presence, the memory of our friend provides us all with an example to which to aspire.

I pass along my sincerest sympathy to his family in this time of sorrow, and wish them an added measure of grace in the days to come.

Mr. ORTON. Madam Speaker, it is always sad to hear of the death of a colleague. The sense of loss is all the more acute in the case of PAUL HENRY, whose decency, strong religious grounding and ability to bridge political partisanship made him a friend on both sides of the aisle.

PAUL was popular with his constituents and popular with his colleagues. He was serious about improving the educational standards of this country. He sought what he thought to be the best solution to each public policy issue regardless of whether this labeled him as a liberal or conservative. His background in the Peace Corps, in academia and in State politics gave him an even-handedness which we all admire.

One of PAUL's greatest legacies to this body will be the example of his character: forged from solid values and yet dedicated to hearing all sides and finding common ground. He will be sorely missed.

I extend my prayers and sympathies to PAUL's wife, Karen Anne, and his three children.

Mr. CLINGER. Madam Speaker, the death of PAUL HENRY is an enormous loss to the Congress and to this Nation. His probing intellect and dedication to this institution were an asset that will not easily be replaced.

PAUL was a tireless worker on behalf of his constituents who were extraordinarily well served throughout his 9 years of service in this body. He was a man of great compassion for those in our society who were down-trodden or in pain and worked tirelessly to address the concerns and resolve the problems which individual constituents brought to him.

PAUL HENRY was a man of ideas. He was an intellectual force in this House—one whose thoughtful contributions to debate were always listened to and respected even if one did not agree with his position. He relished the give and take, thrust and parry of the debates. As a senior member of the Education and Labor Committee he was a regular and valued participant during the consideration of some of

the most contentious and controversial issues over this last decade.

I have known PAUL best as a Member of the House Wednesday Group. To all of his colleagues in the group, he was a warm and thoughtful friend. Moreover, he was a friend whose judgment one could rely upon completely. On issues coming to the House floor from his committee with which I was unfamiliar, I came to trust PAUL's counsel and analysis with ever increasing confidence. He was always a solid and totally reliable resource.

It is difficult to accept the loss of someone with such talent and with so much promise for the future. PAUL HENRY has made a lasting contribution to this place and has touched the lives of many, many people. The tragedy is that his death cut short a life of such exceptional promise.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Madam Speaker, I join in mourning the passing of our colleague PAUL HENRY. He was a man who served his constituents well, but more importantly, he was a man who was respected for his honesty and integrity, and he will be missed.

PAUL was an independent-minded Congressman, a political scientist who understood the ways of Congress and who held a deep and abiding respect for this institution. At the same time, his deep religious faith and moral convictions led him to take principled stands that sometimes would have been easier to have avoided. But all of us who knew him understood and respected his views, his faith and his hard work.

The reception he received this January when he briefly returned to Washington to be sworn-in stands as vocal testimony for the respect PAUL had on both sides of the aisle.

With the rest of my colleagues, I join in extending my condolences to PAUL's wife, Karen, and their three children. I hope they are comforted in their faith, and in the knowledge that PAUL HENRY leaves a legacy that will not soon be forgotten.

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Speaker, with great sadness I rise today in tribute to the distinguished Representative of Michigan's Third Congressional District, PAUL HENRY.

I had the opportunity to serve with Congressman HENRY, my neighbor to the north, on the Committee on Science, Space and Technology and the Committee on Education and Labor. On both panels, Congressman HENRY was respected by Republicans and Democrats alike for his keen understanding of complex legislative issues and for his willingness to work with Members from both sides of the aisle in an effort to develop good public policy. As a new Member of Congress, I believe that PAUL HENRY's independence, dedication and integrity were an example of what a representative of the people should strive to be.

But what touched me most about PAUL HENRY was his faith in God and his loyalty to his family. For PAUL HENRY, his service as a U.S. Representative did not eclipse his commitment to God and to his wife Karen and their children, Kara, Jordan and Megan. He never forgot that he was a Christian. He never forgot that he was a husband. He never forgot that he was a father.

May the wonderful examples of PAUL HENRY live long after his passing.

Mr. CRANE. Madam Speaker, PAUL HENRY will always be remembered by his colleagues as a conscientious, hard working Member of the House of Representatives who well-served the citizens of Michigan who sent him to this chamber. He will also be remembered as a good friend who continually sought to be helpful.

And those who sent him to Washington to look after their interests should know that PAUL had the most fiscally responsible voting record in the Michigan congressional delegation. He was well known to us as one who was concerned with reducing the overall cost of government. He fought the extravagances of the "tax and spend" group who believe big government and big spending provide the answer to every problem this country faces.

PAUL's last election victory will long be remembered by many of us. He continued his campaign for reelection in November although he underwent major surgery in late October. And almost two-thirds of those voting in that election contest cast their ballots for PAUL.

PAUL was born 51 years ago in my home town of Chicago and, as you might imagine, he had a close link with members of the Chicago area delegation. Following graduation from high school in California, he returned to Illinois for his collegiate education. After obtaining a bachelor's degree at Wheaton College, he went on to Duke University where he received a Ph.D in political science.

He had an illustrious and, certainly, a most interesting career with service in the Peace Corps in Liberia and Ethiopia; teaching assignments at Calvin College in Michigan and Duke University; membership on the Michigan State Board of Education; and election to the Michigan State House of Representatives and Senate before his first of five elections to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1984.

PAUL HENRY was a gentleman, an outstanding Member of Congress and a friend.

We extend our sympathy to his wife, Karen, and to his children, Kara, Jordan and Megan.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Madam Speaker, today we remember and pay tribute to PAUL B. HENRY.

Congressman, State representative, political scientist, Peace Corps volunteer, father, husband and devout christian, he brought to this Chamber a wealth of life experience that made him an independent thinker and a distinguished individual.

His struggle with cancer moved all of us, from his diagnosis during last fall's campaign to his reelection only weeks after surgery, from his emotional return here for the swearing in of the 103d Congress to the grace he showed in his last months. As he addressed his colleagues not long ago in Roll Call, "I count as one of God's great blessings the opportunity to serve with so many fine people. Caring and thoughtfulness know no political party."

PAUL HENRY will be missed. My condolences go out to his wife, Karen, and three children.

Mr. GALLO. Madam Speaker, just a few weeks ago, we lost a good friend and valued colleague, the Honorable PAUL B. HENRY of Michigan.

PAUL and I came to Congress in 1985 and our friendship was forged during the early de-

bates in the House on the Republican's role as the minority party and on our mutual commitment to the cause of responsible conservatism.

Because we both came from State legislatures, we shared many insights on the legislative process and its impact on people. He understood, as we all must, that the first question about a pending piece of legislation must be, how will this affect my constituents?

PAUL's abiding strength during good times and bad was derived from his faith—his religious faith, and his faith in the democratic process.

In that fine combination of personal faith and public dedication, PAUL said many times that he considered his opportunity for public service to be one of the great blessings of his life.

And, at a time when it has become fashionable in the media and among the public to see dark political motives in the every action of each Member of this House, PAUL stood as the proof that those critics were wrong—the highest calling for service in this House is the ability to reach out to people and to understand their concerns.

PAUL knew that service means more than just understanding. It includes a commitment that each of us makes to do our best every day to give the average citizen a level playing field in dealing with a government that has become too big and too impersonal.

In a town where it is big business to second-guess the actions of elected officials and to label them based on the causes they champion, it is a great complement to PAUL that no one was ever able to put a label on him.

He took each issue as an opportunity to solve problems for people and he always called them as he saw them, based on his own analysis of the situation.

Madam Speaker, it is always difficult to lose a friend and a colleague, but it is particularly sad when that individual is taken at the prime of life.

PAUL HENRY's legacy to us is his dedication to the high principle of public service. His friendship will be greatly missed, but his example will live on among us during these contentious and challenging times.

Our sincere condolences go out to his family, with our heartfelt appreciation for PAUL HENRY's many contributions to our democracy and for his high standard of service to the people of the United States.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, it is with great sadness today that I rise to recognize the outstanding service of my colleague and dear friend PAUL HENRY during his all-too-brief tenure in the House.

As we all know, PAUL passed away May 31 as a result of brain cancer. He is, however, remembered by all of us as a very hard worker—devoted to God, his family, our Nation, and the people of Michigan's 3d Congressional District. PAUL was a political scientist, educated at Wheaton College and Duke University, where he earned his Ph.D. in 1970. Following his service as an aide to former Congressman John Anderson, PAUL when elected to the Michigan House in 1978, and 4 years later, in 1982, PAUL was elected to the Michigan Senate.

In 1984, PAUL came to Washington to serve Congress, and he quickly earned the well-de-

served reputation among his colleagues and others as an honest, thoughtful, and effective Member of the House. As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, PAUL worked to improve the quality of life for all the people of Michigan as well as our entire Nation. He dedicated his time and effort in working to reduce crime on our Nation's streets and improve opportunities for all Americans with regards to jobs and education. He also concentrated on gaining support for legislation he sponsored requiring a 5-cent deposit on beverage cans and bottles. PAUL always was deeply concerned about working conditions for employees, especially construction workers, who face some of the highest rates of death and injury among workers, and employees exposed to hazardous substances.

PAUL's strength and dedication were recognized not only by his colleagues in Congress but more importantly the people he so ably served in the Third Congressional District. Following his victory in 1984 with 62 percent of the vote, PAUL went on to win three more terms in the House, each time compiling well over 70 percent of the vote. The deep support of his constituents meant a great deal to PAUL, and even after PAUL was diagnosed with a brain tumor before the 1992 election, the voters in the Third District acknowledged PAUL's service in the past and his ability to overcome long odds in easily re-electing PAUL to a fifth term.

I know I speak for all of us in recognizing PAUL's accomplishments in the House and his service to our Nation. I, like so many others, will miss PAUL's wisdom, integrity, and civility. We should be guided, however, by the devotion to God and dedication to country by which PAUL HENRY lived. His outstanding career in the House will always be remembered. To his wife Karen, his three children, and his parents Dr. and Mrs. Carl Henry, we offer our deepest sympathy.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, this special order in memory of our former colleague, PAUL HENRY, is truly a sad occasion. No one would have thought a year ago that we would be paying our last respects to such a young, energetic, and bright man. When PAUL went home to Michigan last October to campaign for reelection, he had already served the people of the 6th District of Michigan for 8 years, and we certainly had no reason to suspect he would not be back to complete another term.

I had the privilege serving with PAUL on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee for the 8½ years he spent in Congress, an assignment which I know he considered an important priority. During those 8 years I came to know him and to respect him as a thoughtful and always knowledgeable member of the committee. Earlier this year, the committee confirmed his appointment as the ranking Republican member of the Investigations and Oversight Subcommittee; unfortunately, we never had the benefit of his leadership in that post. He was also deeply committed to his work on the Education and Labor Committee.

PAUL's contribution in the fields of science and technology and education has not gone unnoticed, however. Grand Valley State University announced last week that it plans to name its new science complex at its Allendale campus in his honor. This is a fitting tribute to

PAUL, combining his interest in improving the quality of education with his recognition that a strong science and technology base will keep this Nation prosperous.

We will miss PAUL's wisdom and experience. I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife, Karen, and their children for their loss.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Madam Speaker, PAUL HENRY was a friend—a decent, intelligent man, and a special "life giver." He was what this institution needs in bucketfuls—a fine person, broad gauge, with a deep sense not of self service, but of service.

No man is irreplaceable, but PAUL comes closer than almost any I know.

Mr. FISH. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening to pay tribute to PAUL HENRY. PAUL's steadfast ideals and dedication to the people of Michigan and the entire country brought honor to the institutions in which he served, and his work and commitment will not be forgotten.

Ever since he came to Congress in 1985, I knew him to be a thoughtful, diligent contributor who made friends quickly and easily. He shared his life with others; serving in the Peace Corps, teaching college, and then representing the Grand Rapids area in both State and Federal politics. He was widely respected by Members on both sides of the aisle, and he fought his illness with great courage and dignity.

I would like to express my deepest sympathy to PAUL's wife, Karen Anne, and their three children. I hope they can take some comfort in knowing that we share their loss. We miss him.

Mr. BAKER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the ability to stand for principle, and yet not be unreasonable in your perspective is a rare gift. To attend to every responsibility, and yet have time for everyone, is a difficult task. But to remain a sensitive and caring person in the midst of public life, may be the most challenging task of all. PAUL HENRY, was not just a Congressman, he was a caring man who fought for principle and who believed in his country. He was always ready to help a friend, but never failed to perform his duties as a Member of Congress.

The loss to his family is painful and deep. Among his broad circle of friends there is much emptiness. There are many with whom he worked who will miss his strong leadership. But this great country will be less determined and less noble, less able to become what we all hope for, without the strength of PAUL HENRY.

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Congress has lost one of its most dedicated Members with the untimely death of PAUL HENRY. Representative HENRY and I first met when we served in the Michigan State legislature together during the late 1970's. It was then that I first had the opportunity to realize what a caring and giving public servant PAUL HENRY was. Years later, it was my honor to serve with him again, here in the House of Representatives.

PAUL HENRY quickly distinguished himself in Congress by serving as a strong voice for children and education. He made certain that their voice was heard by initiating the College Savings Bond Program and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

PAUL HENRY faced his battle with cancer as he tackled every other challenge—with a courage and strength that served as an inspiration to all of us.

There is no greater tragedy than that of unrealized potential. It is tragic, indeed, that this body and our Nation will be denied the benefits of the future achievements of PAUL HENRY. The *National Journal* recently deemed PAUL HENRY "A Rising Star." We can now only speculate as to just how high PAUL's star would have climbed, and how many voiceless children would have benefited from its rise.

PAUL HENRY's legacy as a public servant, however, will not die. It has been said that no amount of darkness can overcome the light of a single candle. During his life PAUL HENRY lit a candle of commitment, dedication and excellence that will burn in all of our hearts and souls, forever.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I was privileged to attend, with many of my colleagues, the memorial service for PAUL HENRY in Grand Rapids, the depth of loss felt by all was unmistakable. Here is a man who, while some comfort can be taken in knowing that today he sits with God, will be truly missed—in his home district, in his home State of Michigan, here in Congress, and among all those he touched during his all too brief journey on this Earth.

Although it sounds trite I suppose, to say Paul was a man who, when he came to that fork in the road, usually took the one less traveled. Oh, I'm sure, politics occasionally played a role in that decision, but more often he took that road because it was the course demanded by his sense of what was the right thing to do. These weren't decisions Paul made lightly, based on some quick gut reaction that can be categorized under one political philosophy, but rather ones based on a very deliberative, thoughtful review of everything he could get his hands on pertinent to the relevant issues. Described by his first primary opponent as a "John Anderson Liberal Republican," PAUL, in fact, defied political labels, often following the Republican mainstream but, as often, charting his own course.

Examples on the Committee on Education and Labor range from the large to the small. Last year he spearheaded the development of an OSHA reform bill when, frankly, it was a less than popular thing to do with either the business community or even many of his fellow members on the committee. However, his efforts set the stage and will be built upon this year. Similarly, a few years back, he developed a key alternative on occupational disease notification with then-ranking Jim Jeffords.

He was heavily involved in job training issues, with a constant commitment to watching out for older workers. But I also remember the smaller examples which bear out PAUL's fine attention to detail and his willingness to cut across the grain. He supported the original Civil Rights Act of 1990 when his party and President were opposed, but conditioned that support on the correction of one little-noticed, but important, provision dealing with attorney fees. He knew it was wrong and although few of the rest of us paid much attention to it—and the press even less—worked successfully behind the scenes to correct it. There was no glory here, only hard work.

In another situation, he successfully worked to correct a highly technical, but critical, problem concerning ERISA preemption of State prevailing wage laws when, frankly, few were supportive of his efforts. Now, however, that same bill is up again for consideration on the House floor and the fix PAUL negotiated is known as the Henry language, and we are fortunate he paid attention to the small details when the rest of us did not.

But let me talk about some other areas where Paul's contributions were crucial.

First and foremost, PAUL HENRY was an educator and a Member who turned his intellectual powers on issues he believed had moral, educational, or religious significance. For example, when the committee was drafting Federal child care legislation, he was a major proponent of allowing religious institutions to participate. He believed in the need for quality child care services for young children but also believed we should respect the parent's choice to give their children a moral and religious training.

In 1990, drawing on his love of the arts, his commitment to free expression, and his strong moral code, PAUL HENRY played a key role in crafting compromise legislation that ensured the reauthorization and continuation of the National Endowment for the Arts.

As a former college professor, PAUL believed that all Americans had a right to a higher education and should be encouraged to do the very best. He was an active member of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, and through his intellect and attention to detail, he made many contributions over the years to the Higher Education Act.

PAUL was willing to take sides on issues that politics alone would have led him to avoid. For example, in 1991, it became known that USDA's regulations for the WIC Program were going to continue excluding cereals that contained fruit from WIC food packages. Given the importance of this industry in his district, one might think he would have come down hard on the Agency. Instead, Mr. HENRY was persuaded that the WIC regulations excluding cereals that contained fruit were warranted. A few weeks later Mr. HENRY met with Kellogg's executives and, in effect, told them he was going to stand by the USDA position.

These are small examples in a life rich with many contributions that demonstrate PAUL's devotion to getting things right—and in doing the right thing—and they provide just a small insight into why he was so highly respected in the House. He will be sorely missed in the committee and the Congress as a whole.

PAUL HENRY was a man who took politics seriously because of the effect laws can have on others, but he never took himself too seriously as a politician. He could step back from it all and put it in the context of his faith and his family, whom he put first in his life—ahead of politics. The rest of us can learn from the course he set and only hope to do half as well.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. VELAZQUEZ). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ON NAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. VELAZQUEZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

IN TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HON. PAUL B. HENRY

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, in listening to the prior special order, I must add my own comments, as a sister from the neighboring State of Ohio, to my colleagues in the Michigan delegation, to the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman FRED UPTON, a friend to all of us here and, certainly, a lifelong friend to PAUL HENRY and to his family.

What a credit to PAUL. He is smiling down on all of you right now, paying such a beautiful eloquent tribute to such a fine, good, decent man.

As emotional as the tribute was, I think he would be a bit humbled by it all and probably would not have wanted you to do it. But I know that from my own experience with him, in traveling that route between Washington and Detroit Airport oftentimes, what amazed me about PAUL was how he always found time to read books, which is so very hard in this job.

I do not think in the years that I have served with PAUL HENRY there was ever an unkind word that I heard the man utter to anyone. He truly was a gentleman's gentleman and raised the level of this institution. I know with capable leaders like the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON], his legacy will continue in this Congress. I am just honored to have been here in the Chamber when this tribute was paid by the entire Michigan delegation and as a next-door Buckeye from the State of Ohio. I am just glad to have known our dear colleague, PAUL HENRY, and wish his family, Karen and Kara and Jordan and Megan, Godspeed in the days and the weeks and the months ahead. Your strength will strengthen them.

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE ARAB AND JEWISH COMMUNITIES OF GREATER TOLEDO

Madam Speaker, I wanted also to place in the RECORD this evening a beautiful statement that was written and signed today, this historic day of September 13, 1993, on the day that the Working Peace Accord and Statement of Principles was signed by the nation of Israel and the Palestinian Liberation Organization.

In my home community of Toledo, OH, northwest Ohio, a wonderful event occurred. I am very fortunate to represent a community that has a large number of citizens who trace their origins to the Middle East. They are peo-

ple who come from different faiths, Jewish, Christian, Muslim, but together they have helped to build one of the finest communities in the United States of America.

Today, they gathered at the Federal building in downtown Toledo as the ceremony was transpiring on the lawn of the White House, and they drafted their own statement and signed it as a community of great hope, a statement of hope, that I would like to read into the RECORD.

It says:

We, the members of the Arab and Jewish communities of Greater Toledo, representing the Christian, Muslim and Jewish faiths, have issued the following joint statement acknowledging our common support of the Declaration of Principles agreed upon by the State of Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization.

The Arab and Jewish communities of Greater Toledo join together today in thanksgiving and in appreciation for this historic beginning. This event marks the dawning of a new era in the relations between the Israeli and Palestinian peoples, which will hopefully in turn usher in an era of peace for all parties to the Middle East conflict.

We realize that there will be many challenges that will be confronted during the days and years which lie ahead. We hope and we pray that a rapport of trust and confidence will be established which allows for the creation of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace for all the peoples of the region.

This special part of the world, the birthplace of Judaism, Christianity and Islam, gave the world a vision of peace inscribed in our sacred writings—the Torah, the New Testament and the Koran. It is most appropriate that the peoples of the region realize the beautiful vision of their prophets and teachers. We fervently join together as communities intricately bound to the Middle East with our sincere and earnest prayer. May God grant the leaders of the Middle East the wisdom and the insight to fulfill the goal of an everlasting peace for our brothers and sisters.

□ 2030

The signers of this statement of hope were from our community: Laila Asad, Rabbi Arnold Beinstock, Nabil L. Hanna, Nadeem Salem, Mr. Steve Edelstein, Reverend Michael Elias, Yehia Shousher, Mr. Neil Light, Michael Sugheir, Joanne Rubin, Samir Abu Absi, Rabbi Alan Sokobin, Maryse Mikhail, Michael Berebitsky, Howard Fried, Marla Levine, and Jack Gallon.

Madam Speaker, I include for the record this statement and the names just noted.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to say what an honor it is for me to serve citizens like these in the Nation's Capital. In watching their faces today as we jointly watched that ceremony on the White House lawn, and sharing that very historic moment with them, it gives me a great fullness of heart to know that there are citizens like this in our country who are not narrowly focused, but who reach across the lines

of faith and heritage and have good will for all people. It is a great honor for me to enter their names in the historic record this evening of September 13, 1993.

Madam Speaker, I would like to move on to events that are before us this week here in Washington, D.C., because we expect this week, probably tomorrow, the President of the United States to make a major statement from the White House with the support of several others to push through this Congress this fall a treaty, actually an executive agreement, that was negotiated by the Bush Administration, more familiarly known as the North American Free Trade Agreement.

In my own judgment, I hardly think it will be free. We have here in Washington the situation now where lobbyists are literally prowling the halls trying to ram through this Congress an agreement that does not have the support of the American people. They are spending a lot of money to do it. This is an issue where the American people must speak up. They must speak up to their Members of Congress and they must speak up to the Members of the other body, for fully \$25 million and more will be spent to try to push this agreement through Congress.

What makes it so troublesome, if we look at the document which is about 2,000 pages long, and I have read it, and I am waiting for the President to send up the side agreements, it is written in language that I am sure most college professors would have difficulty deciphering. It is not a document of high purpose. It is a document of technicality. It will be a lawyers' field day. Lawyers from this country, from other nations, will have to define words that are left hanging in the text.

I really am concerned about what it will mean for the future of our country, our working people, our farmers, those who govern our States, localities, our small businesses, so many people who have so much at risk with this agreement that is largely not well publicized and not well understood by the public.

Thousands and thousands of jobs and companies and businesses and farm enterprises are on the line in our country as a result of this negotiated agreement. The agreement was really done by what I would call experts, trade experts, people who are not subject to election by the people of the United States.

We know that this is an agreement that will not be debated. Of the three countries that it concerns, the United States, Canada, and Mexico, the agreement will not be debated in Mexico, because Mexico does not allow for dissent or full debate on any issue. It is a one-party state. It is a nation that borders us on the south, but its traditions and its political systems are very, very different from our own.

In Canada the vast majority of Canadian people do not support this agreement. Yet that government allowed the agreement to be approved with very little debate. Where will this agreement rest for full debate? In this Chamber, in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the most democratic body of government on the face of the Earth. We welcome that debate.

This week it was announced that in Glendale, WI, Briggs-Stratton Co. will move an additional 230 jobs to Mexico, jobs lost in the State of Wisconsin. The press release read that those jobs would be expanded after August of 1994. Very interesting, the timing on the movement of jobs from the United States to Mexico. We have already lost over 2,100 companies south of the border. Now they anticipate over 700,000 people employed at very low wages south of the border, while our people are forced to look for work, more people working part-time in our country than ever before in our history, people who do not get full benefits, people who are having difficulty supporting their families, and the people in Mexico who end up working in these jobs, not earning a living wage.

Who is really making money out of this deal? I find it ironic that one of the corporations that is supporting this accord, IBM, recently announced thousands and thousands and thousands of layoffs in our country. Yet they are here in Washington trying to lobby this agreement so that more of those jobs, IBM jobs, can be moved to Mexico. Is that right? Is that really the best we can do as a country and as a continent?

We know that other companies are poised to move south. In fact, the State of Yucatan in Mexico has advertisements in the trade magazines telling our companies just to call a number and they will make it very easy for companies to find labor, people who will work for \$1 an hour. Is that the best we can do as a country and as a continent?

I would say to Members of Congress who are listening to this special order this evening, if they have not traveled the highways and the byways of Mexico, they should not vote for this agreement. If they have only traveled to the tourist spots of Acapulco and Puerto Vallarta and Cancun, they should not vote for this agreement. They should put themselves in the shoes of the people of our country who have lost their jobs, and the list is endless, then go see where those jobs have gone in Mexico, and then make their judgment.

This past May I, along with the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY], who spoke earlier this evening, led a congressional bipartisan delegation of eight women Members on a factfinding mission to Mexico to find out what happened to our jobs and to

examine the human face of trade, the people who are affected in our country and in Mexico, and what effect has U.S. trade with Mexico and the presence there of over 2,100 of our companies had on our people here back at home, and also on the people of Mexico; how have our people benefited, and how have Mexican workers and their families benefited, or have they rather suffered from the growing transnational company presence in that country?

What has happened to living conditions here in our country, and what about in Mexico? It is particularly vital that we ask these questions because we expect the full court press to begin this week to try to line up votes in this Congress. By any measure, NAFTA will increase United States corporate movement to Mexico. Whatever effect these corporations have had on the Mexican people up to now, this accord will amplify. We know over 700,000 U.S. jobs are already located south of our border, and they have moved there at an alarming rate since 1985. They are companies whose names we recognize. In fact, if I unrolled them, we could wrap the room with their names.

They are names you know: Proctor Silex out of North Carolina; Trico out of Buffalo, NY; Delco from Indiana; General Motors, from throughout the United States; Green Giant from California; Converse shoes. You had better check the labels on your shoes. Then here is Dura Corp. from my own community in Toledo, OH, and Zenith Corp. Zenith, remember, those are the televisions that used to be made in the United States. They put out of work thousands of workers in Illinois, thousands of workers in Missouri, and now 12,000 people of Mexico are employed in the Zenith plant down there.

□ 2040

And all of that production is sent back here to the United States. The people of Mexico cannot afford to buy the televisions they are making.

And what happened to the workers of the United States who used to work at Zenith, where are all of these stories in the press about what happened to our people? The press is almost silent on the thousands and thousands and hundreds of thousands of U.S. citizens whose lives have been impacted by the movement of these jobs to the south. Where are the old investigative reporters? Where are the modern-day Edward R. Murrows? Where are the stories that should be written about our people who are out there trying to make it after their jobs have moved out of town?

I asked myself throughout our visit who has benefited from all of this. What we found in Mexico was dismaying. The Mexican people who work at the plants called maquiladora plants, and that is translated golden mills, and I can tell you who is making the gold,

have not benefited from their association with these companies. Worker after worker related their personnel stories of subsistence pay. One woman said to me, "MARCY, you must understand. I work for hunger wages." She does not make enough to support her family, but she lives at the edge of survival.

Dangerous working conditions. A man who worked in a furnace in a U.S.-owned company whose job was to crawl up into that furnace every night, and to clean it out with no protection, no ability to wash off those chemicals. And his wife told me when he comes home at night he is blue in the face, and he is sick, and he has very bad headaches. No one cares. There is no occupational safety and health protections for the people in that country.

Exploitation by American managers and companies. Yes, exploitation. I talked to one plant manager who drove down to a company every day. He lived in California, went into Mexico during the day, and drove back to California at night. And I said, "Sir, how much do these workers in your plant make for social security benefits? Do they get to put aside social security?" He said, "Congresswoman, I don't worry about that. I worry about the bottom line." I said, "Well, sir, if you don't worry, who does worry about these workers?" They have no voice. And what about denial of labor rights. What about the fact that the people there cannot speak up for themselves? They do not have the legal protections of citizens in our country. They do not have a court system like ours.

And what a shame that the side agreement on labor that was supposed to be put into this treaty has come up so short. If there is a violation, if someone really wants to wage a complaint, and they are found guilty, there is no sanction, there is no penalty. It is a toothless side agreement, and even if it were an agreement that had some teeth, we were told by the Secretary of Commerce of the nation of Mexico that the side agreement will have no ability to really affect anything in the main body of the agreement. That is not something I want to buy for the people of our country.

We compiled data while we were down there and actual samples that show the exploitation of the Mexican workers by United States companies does not stop at the factory door. In fact, we went through the neighborhoods, we went through the industrial parks. We saw the release of toxic chemicals into the environment near where the people lived. United States companies operating in Mexico have created a severe health risk. A multi-billion-dollar continental cleanup problem exists already, and this accord has not even been passed. We ought to clean up the past mess before we allow any more to be created.

The samples that we took in these communities were contaminated with such toxic industrial pollutants as lead, mercury, benzene, xylene. These are dangerous chemicals. Some concentrations were so great that the samples would be considered as hazardous waste in our country, and our samples were taken from shallow drainage ditches that ran unfenced behind residential and industrial areas where children played and livestock grazed. Clearly, the manufacturers responsible for this pollution have not made a good-faith effort, and I underline good-faith, to comply with the requirements of Mexican environmental law or of plain common sense. They have created a life-threatening continental mess that will cost billions of dollars to clean up.

And where is that money to clean it up supposed to come from? Certainly not from the taxpayers of the United States who have lost their jobs by the thousands to Mexico? Why should they be asked to pay? And certainly not the citizens of Mexico who are earning such low wages they cannot even afford to buy what they make? Certainly not them. And so where is the money to come from for all of the cleanup?

Most of the samples that we took had an extremely high number of coliforms and fecal coliforms in drinking water, too dangerous to drink, indicating that the areas from which those samples were taken right near where people lived were contaminated with human fecal matter. That is not surprising. People who work at United States-owned factories in Mexico live in communities without running water, no electricity, no heat in the wintertime, and no sewage system. Their ramshackle outhouses are often flooded. And it is no wonder that they have had outbreaks of cholera, typhoid fever having been reported, and where some of the water drains into our country serious, serious problems with hepatitis B.

We have released a report that is available to the public entitled "Economic and Environmental Conditions in the Lower Rio Grande Valley along the Texas-Mexico Border." This report finds that United States-owned plants in Mexico have flaunted Mexican environmental requirements and have contributed to environmental degradation. And if you would like a report all you have to do is write Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR, U.S. Congress, Washington, DC. They will find me. I will send you that report.

As disturbing as our findings are, it is certain that conditions for Mexican families will worsen if this agreement is approved. By easing investment rules, this agreement will increase United States investment in Mexico, and that means more factories down there doing business as usual, contaminating their own workers and communities.

A second report that has been released that I can make available is one entitled "NAFTA's Corporate Cadre." This report, released by the Institute of Policy Studies here in Washington, details the leadership of the organizations here in Washington promoting this treaty, and the main one is called USA-NAFTA, and it is dominated by the heaviest polluters. Ten of the top leaders in this pro-NAFTA coalition rank in the top 30 U.S. releasers of toxics in 1992. You know some of the names. Du Pont ranks No. 1. Monsanto, No. 3. 3M is No. 8. Now these companies are working with the USA-NAFTA coalition that is going to be coming out with a big press announcement this week so that they can go to Mexico and pollute down there and leave a legacy for us to have to clean up in this country with Superfund money. We can only imagine what this means for the health and safety of millions of people who will reside on this continent in the years to come.

Our delegation took samples at sites along the border which showed dangerous toxic contamination. For instance, one sample we took from an open ditch that runs between various chemical companies in a residential area close to the GM plant located, called Finsa in Matamoros, Mexico, contained enough petroleum hydrocarbons to qualify it as a hazardous waste four times over under the definitions used in our country. High levels of mercury were also present. The samples also were contaminated with benzene, toluene, ethyl benzene, and xylene, again at levels to qualify as hazardous waste.

□ 2050

Further east along the same canal closer to residential areas, a sludge sample that we tested contained mercury at 145 times acceptable levels. These industrial pollutants cause brain damage, birth defects, and other health problems. We also obtained samples from the soil and water in the residential communities, known as colonias, where the people live down there. Many of these people lived near the companies that had moved down there from our country. Many of these residential areas are sited very close to the companies, the companies and their toxic chemicals. The colonias are also without those basics necessary to human health—running water and sewers, decent sewage control—even those residents working at plants that were so spanking brand-new that you would swear you must be in a suburban area of the United States, in industrial areas.

But just go to where the workers live; one water sample we took from a residential area was contaminated with coliform bacteria at 400 times our standards here. A soil sample we took from where children were playing was

contaminated with coliform at rates 1,500 times U.S. standards. A third sample that we took was taken near a water outlet where children run through and play near, an outhouse. It was contaminated with coliform at rates over 1,000 times U.S. standards. We released these results from our trip to the colonia roma in Reynosa, Mexico, and we know that that type of bacteria and exposure is linked to typhoid fever and cholera.

Let me say that Reynosa is home to some companies that you would know the names of: General Electric, General Motors, TRW Corporation, and many, many other U.S. companies.

This NAFTA agreement must be defeated, and in its place we must negotiate a trade agreement that does not jeopardize the jobs or the standard of living or the environmental conditions of the people of the United States of America but also genuinely addresses the terrible conditions of the region south of the border.

We need tough enforcement of international standards, we need to uphold the standard of living of the United States and our democratic principles as what we expect of the nations to the south of us that wish to do business with us, and we need secure and dedicated funding sources paid for by the polluters, adequate to clean up both present and future contamination.

In future days I will be reading from many of the people whom we visited while we were in Mexico, particularly those who have been silenced by their own governments. I will enter those into the RECORD.

Madam Speaker, I make a plea to the President of our country to try to build democracy through any agreement to which the United States is a party. Trade is not enough by itself, but in fact the power of this marketplace must be used to build democracy in all nations whose people hunger for a better way of life, and a functioning democracy should be the first threshold of entry into any common market of the Americas.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. INHOFE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. INHOFE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HYDE, for 60 minutes each day, on September 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, and October 1.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LAROCCO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, on September 14.
 Mr. LAROCO, for 5 minutes, on September 14.
 Mr. DINGELL, for 60 minutes, today.
 Mrs. MALONEY, for 60 minutes, on September 28.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. INHOFE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 Mr. GALLO.
 Mr. SOLOMON in two instances.
 Mr. HYDE.
 Mr. SANTORUM.
 Mr. GILMAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LAROCO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 Mr. FARR.
 Mr. BECERRA.
 Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
 Mr. MARTINEZ.
 Mr. FORD of Tennessee.
 Mr. SANGMEISTER.
 Mr. OLVER.
 Mr. SLATTERY.
 Ms. DELAURO, in two instances.
 Mr. BLACKWELL.
 Mr. MOAKLEY.
 Mr. DEUTSCH.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. KAPTUR) and to include extraneous matter:)

Ms. KAPTUR.
 Mr. CLAY.
 Mr. SERRANO.
 Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.
 Mr. FORD of Tennessee.
 Mr. DE LUGO.
 Mr. TRAFICANT.
 Mr. HUGHES.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS AND A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 50. Joint resolution to designate the weeks of September 19, 1993, through September 25, 1993, and of September 18, 1994, through September 24, 1994, as "National Rehabilitation Week," to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 94. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 3, 1993, through October 9, 1993, as "National Customer Service Week," to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the sixtieth anniversary of the Ukraine famine of 1932-1933 should serve as a reminder of the brutality of Stalin's repressive policies to-

ward the Ukrainian people, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 126. Joint resolution designating September 10, 1993, as "National POW/MIA Recognition Day" and authorizing the display of the National League of Families POW/MIA flag.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 14, 1993, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1870. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of September 1, 1993, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. 103-134); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1871. A letter from the Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification of the Navy's intent to offer for transfer a vessel to the Government of Morocco, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2321j; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1872. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the fourth biennial report of the Director of the National Institutes of Health, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 283; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1873. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of a proposed transfer of United States origin major defense equipment by the Government of the United Kingdom to the Government of Austria (Transmittal No. DRSA-1-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1874. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the report of political contributions by Edward P. Djerejian, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to Israel and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1875. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by Thomas A. Loftus, of Wisconsin, to be Ambassador to Norway; of Alan John Blinken, of New York, to be Ambassador to Belgium; of Swannee Grace Hunt, of Colorado, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Austria; of Parker W. Borg, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador to Iceland; of William Lacy Swing, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador to Haiti; and members of their families, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1876. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by Thomas Michael Tolliver Niles, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador to Greece; by Richard W. Teare, of Ohio to be Ambassador to the Republic of Vanuatu; and by Edward Joseph Perkins of Oregon, to be Ambassador to Australia; and members of their families, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1877. A letter from the Chairman, the J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board, transmitting the annual report of the Board; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1878. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the final engineering report for the Mni Wiconi Rural Water Project, South Dakota; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1879. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a reporting on emergency vehicle weight restrictions on interstate highways, pursuant to Public Law 102-240, section 1023(e)(4) (105 Stat. 1955); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1880. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a copy of the report of building project survey for Rockford, IL; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1881. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting the AID section 653(a) report—development assistance program allocations—fiscal year 1993; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

1882. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the National Technical Information Service for fiscal years 1991 and 1992, pursuant to Public Law 100-519, section 212(f)(3) (102 Stat. 2596); jointly, to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DERRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 250. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1340) to provide funding for the resolution of failed savings associations, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-237). Referred to the House Calendar.

SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON BILLS INITIALLY REFERRED UNDER TIME LIMITATIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X, the following actions were taken by the Speaker:

[Submitted September 10, 1993]

The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1845; H.R. 1845 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. SAXTON):

H.R. 3049. A bill to extend the current interim exemption under the Marine Mammal Protection Act for commercial fisheries until April 1, 1994; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H.R. 3050. A bill to expand the boundaries of the Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H.R. 3051. A bill to provide that certain property located in the State of Oklahoma owned by an Indian housing authority for the purpose of providing low-income housing shall be treated as Federal property under the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, 81st Congress); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SANTORUM:

H.R. 3052. A bill to amend the Harmonized tariff Schedule of the United States to correct the tariff treatment of certain nickel catalysts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VALENTINE:

H.R. 3053. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1997, the duty on keto ester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3054. A bill to revive and extend until January 1, 1996, the suspension of duty on norfloxacin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3055. A bill to revive and extend until January 1, 1996, the suspension of duty on Tfa Lys Pro in free base and tosyl salt forms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 3056. A bill to amend certain provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to the treatment of Members of Congress for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself and Mr. SOLOMON):

H.J. Res. 259. Joint resolution concerning United States policy towards Somalia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KLECZKA:

H.J. Res. 260. Joint resolution designating the week of October 24 through 30, 1993, as "National Health Care Quality Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H. Con. Res. 142. Concurrent resolution respecting actions to be taken by the Security Council of the United Nations in Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DERRICK:

H. Res. 249. Resolution electing the Honorable G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY, a Representative from the State of Mississippi, as Speaker pro tempore until September 15, 1993; considered and agreed to.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

241. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to the Forestry Incentive Program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

242. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to earthquake funding and earthquake hazard mitigation efforts; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 3057. A bill to renew patent numbered 3,387,268, relating to a quotation monitoring unit, for a period of 10 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 115: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 134: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. KIM, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.
H.R. 207: Mr. ROEMER.

H.R. 214: Mr. DURBIN.
H.R. 302: Mr. SCHAEFER.
H.R. 323: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 465: Mr. ROEMER.
H.R. 500: Mr. VENTO and Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 595: Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 604: Ms. FURSE.
H.R. 608: Ms. THURMAN.
H.R. 611: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 672: Mrs. KENNELLY and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 786: Mr. FAZIO.
H.R. 799: Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.

H.R. 863: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1036: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine and Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 1129: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 1130: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.
H.R. 1156: Mr. BEILENSON and Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 1164: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1194: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BREWSTER.

H.R. 1231: Mr. ROEMER.
H.R. 1251: Mr. PORTMAN.
H.R. 1279: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. CANADY.

H.R. 1300: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 1509: Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 1523: Mr. ROEMER.

H.R. 1595: Mr. BUYER.
H.R. 1627: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina and Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 1775: Mr. UPTON, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 1797: Mr. MILLER of California and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 1798: Mr. WASHINGTON.
H.R. 1799: Mr. WASHINGTON, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 1867: Mr. LEHMAN.
H.R. 1888: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. FISH, and Mr. BERREUTER.

H.R. 1910: Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. TANNER, Mr. SWETT, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ALLARD, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 1948: Ms. BYRNE and Mr. ANDREWS of Maine.

H.R. 2013: Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 2019: Mr. FOGLIETTA.
H.R. 2076: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. LEHMAN.

H.R. 2151: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 2152: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2159: Mr. HUGHES, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 2211: Mr. HERGER and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 2271: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 2292: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2307: Mr. ROGERS.

H.R. 2415: Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 2427: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 2429: Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. FROST, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SWIFT, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2479: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. STOKES, Mr. YATES, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. STARK, and Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 2599: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
H.R. 2606: Mr. SUNDUKIST.

H.R. 2610: Mr. COYNE, Mr. SABO, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 2612: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 2622: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. LEVY.

H.R. 2640: Mrs. VUCANOVICH and Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 2641: Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. WILSON.
H.R. 2646: Mr. DORNAN, Mr. GOSS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 2731: Mr. ZIMMER and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 2745: Mr. RIDGE and Mr. KLING.
H.R. 2831: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 3006: Mr. FORD of Tennessee.
H.R. 3007: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 3021: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. KIM, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 3024: Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. QUILLAN, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.J. Res. 11: Ms. WATERS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WISE, Mr. TANNER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WILSON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. WELDON, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. FROST, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. YATES, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HORN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, and Mr. SISISKY.

H.J. Res. 79: Mr. REGULA and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.J. Res. 86: Mr. STARK, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.J. Res. 112: Mr. SHAW and Mr. BILEY.

H.J. Res. 148: Mr. HAYES, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. McCRERY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. TAUZIN, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. CRANE, Mr. REGULA, Mr.

BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. APPLE-GATE, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. GORDON, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. FOGLETTA, and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.J. Res. 155: Mrs. MINK, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. REGULA, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ROSE, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.J. Res. 242: Mrs. MINK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MANTON, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. COYNE, Mr. SLATTERY, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.J. Res. 256: Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BATE-

MAN, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. CALLAHAN.
H. Con. Res. 56: Mr. SERRANO.
H. Con. Res. 66: Mr. MARKEY and Ms. BYRNE.

H. Con. Res. 95: Mr. CLAY.
H. Con. Res. 104: Ms. MOLINARI.
H. Con. Res. 127: Mr. RIDGE and Mr. KLINK.
H. Con. Res. 138: Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. YATES, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. KING, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. FILNER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. FROST, and Mr. CARDIN.

H. Con. Res. 140: Mr. COX, Mr. HOYER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GALLO, and Mr. LAZIO.

H. Con. Res. 141: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LEVY, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. CAMP.

H. Res. 26: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey and Mr. BAKER of California.

H. Res. 134: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. KIM, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H. Res. 236: Mr. DORNAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. REED, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H. Res. 239: Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. KLUG, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. MANZULLO.

H. Res. 247: Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1490: Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
IN SENATE
SEPTEMBER 13, 1993

REPORT
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENTAL
OPERATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
LEGISLATION
ON
H. R. 1490
AN ACT
TO AMEND
THE
FEDERAL
BANKRUPTCY
ACT, 11 U.S.C. § 541(c)(2),
TO CLARIFY THE
MEANING OF
"DEBTS OF THE
DEBTOR," AND
FOR OTHER
PURPOSES

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT
PRINTING OFFICE
1993

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
IN SENATE
SEPTEMBER 13, 1993

REPORT
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENTAL
OPERATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
LEGISLATION
ON
H. R. 1490
AN ACT
TO AMEND
THE
FEDERAL
BANKRUPTCY
ACT, 11 U.S.C. § 541(c)(2),
TO CLARIFY THE
MEANING OF
"DEBTS OF THE
DEBTOR," AND
FOR OTHER
PURPOSES

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT
PRINTING OFFICE
1993

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
IN SENATE
SEPTEMBER 13, 1993

REPORT
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENTAL
OPERATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
LEGISLATION
ON
H. R. 1490
AN ACT
TO AMEND
THE
FEDERAL
BANKRUPTCY
ACT, 11 U.S.C. § 541(c)(2),
TO CLARIFY THE
MEANING OF
"DEBTS OF THE
DEBTOR," AND
FOR OTHER
PURPOSES

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT
PRINTING OFFICE
1993